







THE

LAWFULNESS

O F

Infant-BAPTISM

PROVED FROM

SCRIPTURE;

WITH

The RIGHT that the INFANTS of Christian Parents have to be Baptiz'd.

Wherein also,

Mr. Gale's Reflections on Mr. Wall's History of INFANT-BAPTISM, are Examin'd and Refuted, so far as they came in the Way of this Discourse.

And all the Objections and Arguments of other Antipadobaptifts, that are of any Weight, are taken off.

Quicunque negat parvulos per Baptismum Christi à perditione liberari, & salutem percipere sempiternam, Anathema sit. Conc. Carthag. 5. ubi præsedit D. Augustinus.

By RICHARD OWEN, Vicar of Iford, in Suffex.

LONDON:

Printed for R. WILKIN, at the King's-Head, in St. Paul's Church Tard. MDCCXXI.

HOUST THE POLICE

A STATE OF THE STA

Beat Control

THE WALL

And the second of the second o



PREFACE.

HEN I compos'd this Piece, I knew not that Mr. Wall design'd a Defence against Mr. Gale's Reslections, nor have I seen it hitherto. But hearing it was out, I consulted with

fome of my Learned and Reverend Brethren, who had perus'd both it, and my Manuscript. And putting the Question, Whether his Defence had not superfeded the Necessity or Usefulness of printing this Piece? I was answered in the Negative. Beside; I knew, that if he kept close to his former Subject, which was to vindicate the Historical Account and primitive Practice of Pædobaptism, from the ancient Monuments of the Church, my Undertaking could no ways interfere with his, but might come in as a proper Supplement. And this shall be all my Apology for its Publication.

Could Confidence carry the Cause for our Antagonists, they are Masters at it, and have that Property to Persection. Seldom has it failed to accompany

A 2 inveterate

inveterate Error, when form'd into Principle, and confirm'd by Practice. Surprizing it is to see with what an Air of Scorn and Contempt they treat all Pædobaptist Writers, and how definitively they advance their own Notions; as if absolute Certainty, and Infallibility itself, was on their side. In the Management of this Controversy, they have shaken Hands with Modesty, and seem to have struck it out from the List of Vertues. And, in all their Books that I have read, they appear to have taken special Care to free this Censure from all Suspicion of

Injustice, or Uncharitableness.

I suppose, Mr. Gale is allowed to be one of the ablest Champions that has taken up the Cudgels for the Baptists. He fairly puts in for his share of Assurance, and scarce comes behind any of his Brethren. Victory is always in his Hand, and with her Laurels he crowns his Temples, when he marches in Triumph over his trissing Adversaries. But what great Reason he has for this Conduct, I hope the Reader will, in good measure, be apprized by the following Discourse. To note all his Miscarriages I do not pretend; but I shall here crave leave to animadvert on a few Passages, that came not in my way conveniently elsewhere.

His Candor and Ingenuity we justly require, when he confounds a considerable Number of our Church men with profess'd Non-Jurors, and asperses them with a strong Affection unto Popery. "Too great a part of the Clergy, 'tis notorious, are either open non-juring Jacobites, or secret, and, there- fore, more mischievous, High-styers; intirely in the Pretender's Interest, and as hearty Friends to Popish Tyranny and Superstition, as ever was the

"the Laudean Faction, What a Number is there of "em, who glory in being call'd High-Church-

" Men, and carefully keep up the Distinction, not-

" withstanding the Queen and Parliament have " often declar'd such to be dangerous Enemies to

" Church and State?" Let. 2. p. 51, 52.

Can this be fair Dealing, when he knew Non-Jurors had separated themselves from our Church, for the most part, and were no more of our Communion, than his own Sectaries; and some of em have since wrote professedly against our Constitution, to justify their Secession from us, not only for Political, but Ecclesiastical Reasons? How then are they to be reputed among the Body of our Clergy, or of the same Church with the High-flyers he mentions? Would his Friend Mr. Stennett pardon this jumbling of distinct Parties together in Mr. Russen? By no means will that Author stand accountable for the wild Opinions and enormous Actions of several Sects that shrouded their Heads under the general Name of Baptists, or Antipædobaptists. Tet will Mr. Gale make Jacobites, and High-Church-men, who have wholly divided Communions, march in the same Column. The Charge of being Friends to Tyranny, and Popishly affected, deserves to be slighted, as the stale Crimination of Men who judge the Heart, contrary to clear Facts and Demonstrations. And, if they think it consistent with the Apostle's Rules of Charity, 1 Cor. xiii. let 'em applaud themselves in their Christian Practice. But if the Highflyers be dangerous Enemies to Church and State, for keeping up a certain Distinction, both Church and State are very unhappy for having few or no Friends. For, all their Opponents are at one End of that Distinction, stinction, and contribute their part to the keeping of

it up.

His Reflections begin with an Arraignment of Heats, Animolities, and the Excesses of Passion, which some body or other entertain'd him with concerning the present Controversy. What Language and Temper his Correspondent express'd, is to me unknown. But if he would have us to be unconcern'd at the Usage we receive, and to handle him with all imaginable Tenderness and good Affection, it is such a reasonable Request as the Danites was to Micah, Judg. xviii. 23. What aileth thee? say they. To whom the injur'd Man replied; Ye have taken away my Gods, and my Priest, and what have I more? and what is this that ye say unto me, What aileth thee? He had only lost all his Accommodations for Religion by their rapacious Hands; and why should he be disturbed at such a trifling Loss? Much alike is our Case. For all Pædobaptists throughout the World, are only un-church'd by the charitable Mr. Gale and his Party. No Ordinations, no Ministers, no Sacraments, no Church, or Church-membership does he leave us, Let. 2. p. 77, 80, 81. Our Church is clean gone, without any Reserve; tho' at the rest he seems to boggle in this smooth and elegant Style: "Tho we do not assert so much, yet, to some, it will, it may be, seem a little probable, that she may, " perhaps, have no Bishops, Presbyters, &c. no law-" ful Ordinations; and (if this should be allowed) "neither of the Sacraments can be duly admini-" stred." But extremely impertinent is this Caution. For if, as he says elsewhere, our Church be like other Societies, then'tis as vain to seek for a Ministry, Ordinations and Sacraments where there is no Church, as it would be to seek for Magistrates, Officers, Law, and Justice in Great Britain, in case there was no Government nor Body Politic there. This strikes deep at our Christianity. And Heathens, his Brother Mr. Canne calls us, in plain Terms, Epist. to Coll. Overton, Governor of Hull. What alleth us now, that we cry after him? Why are we not wonderful calm and kind to these Dissenting Brethren, and give up such cheap Things, as our Church, Ministry, &c. for Peace and Civilities sake? This Thanks has the Government, to be quite un-church'd, for its gracious Indulgence! and all Pædobaptist Dissenters must look to themselves no less than we.

His Hand being in at this un-churching Work, he does, in effect, the same Service to the Jews in our Saviour's Time; "when they had introduc'd such "Abundance of Innovations in their Religion, as "to destroy its Essence." Let. 4. p. 154. If its Essence was destroy'd, its very Being was lost. Then no Religion, no Church; and if neither Church nor Religion, with what did Christ and his Apostles communicate, when they joyn'd with the Jews both in the Temple and Synagogue Worship? They did it; but in vain shall we expect Mr. Gale's Party to be so easy and obsequious towards our Church, whe-

in the Temple and Synagogue Worship? THEY did it; but in vain shall we expect Mr. Gale's Party to be so easy and obsequious towards our Church, whether it has lost its Essence, or not.

Again, we are told; "Tho' it should be granted, "the Church of England, like all other Societies, has Power over her own Body; yet, she has certainly none over those that withdraw from her Communion." And a little lower; "The Dissenters, by being out of her Body, are meerly, on that Account, out of her Power." Into the Merits.

Merits of the Cause we must not examine, but the bare Act of Withdrawing, without any Consideration of Right, is sufficient. Then, if in this respect all other Societies are like our Church, and our Church like them, the King's Subjects need but withdraw from his Allegiance, and form themselves into little separate Bodies, in Cities, Towns, and Country Villages too, as Dissenters have acted towards our Church, and they are, meerly on that Account, out of the Civil Body, and, certainly, out of its Power. So the Preston Gentlemen withdrew, and were executed, not for Rebels, but for Fools; because they knew not how to plead their own Privilege. Precarious indeed are all Governments, if they have no other Cement to fasten them together, beside the Good-Will and Humours of the People! And the State has as much Cause to thank our Author for his Politics, as the Church for his Divinity.

This shall suffice, at present, for a Taste of Mr. Gale's Skill and Accuracy in managing Points of Controversy. More will follow in the proper Places.

Into this Tract I had once inserted various Strictures on Mr. Benj. Keach, a noted Polemical Writer of the Baptists; but, upon better Advice, struck most of 'em out, as not deserving any Regard. So full of Fooleries and Self-contradictions is that Author, that the Man would but greatly disparage himself, who should lose Time and Pains in his Refutation.



THE

LAWFULNESS

O F

Infant-BAPTISM,

Proved from

SCRIPTURE.

PART I.

T is well known, that we have Two principal Controversies in Debate with that Sect of Dissenters, who call themselves by the Name of Baptists. One concerns the Lawfulness of Baptizing the Infants of believing Parents; by whom I always mean Profess'd Believers. This we affert, and they deny, which

Believers. This we affert, and they deny, which diffinguishes us into Padobaptists and Antipadobaptists. The other relates to the Manner of Baptizing; whether it must be by Immersion, or Dipping the Persons under Water, as they maintain; or, whether Affusion, or pouring Water upon the Face, may be sufficient, as we do hold. But why this should be made an irreconcileable Dispute, or at least a Ground of Separation from us, I am not satisfied; unless it

be, that they look upon us to be no True Church, nor to have a True Ministry that can lawfully officiate in the Divine Service. Otherwise, if they would come to us for Baptism, in this particular, they might be gratified. Because our Church commands Dipping upon Condition, and, consequently, prefers it to any other Mode of Administration. And Mr. Gale affirms, it was in Use among us after the Reformation, 'till in Queen Elizabeth's Days it receiv'd a Change. However this be, the fole Province I shall undertake to manage, is, To justifie the Lawfulness of Baptizing Infants, and the Right they have to that Ordinance; which I shall endeavour to do by Scripture Evidences; an Attempt, it seems, that will be strange and furprizing to our Adversaries. For Mr. Gale observes of Mr. Dorrington; " That Author affects "Wonders, and his whole Book is one, in which "he undertakes to prove Infant-Baptism from Scripture; which is as much as to say, the Scrip-"ture positively afferts what it does not speak "one Word of." And he commends Mr. Wall's Modesty, Ingenuity, and Wisdom, for declining the Combat with that Weapon; whereas Mr. Dor-rington much expos'd himelf by taking the other Method, Refl. Let. 7. p. 258. This is somewhat af-frightning. Nevertheless, I shall venture upon it, fince to the Scripture our Antagonists make their last and sole Appeal; and if in this Enterprize we can have good Success, by Mr. Gale's Account, it must be wonderful.

Pursuant to my Design, the main Argument I intend to insist upon, shall be taken from God's Act and Order to admit Infants, by Circumcision, into the Patriarchal Church and Covenant. And to ground my Argument on a firm Base, and clear it of all material Objections, I shall proceed in the

following Method.

I. I

- I. I shall prove, That the Covenant which God made with Abraham and his Seed, was, in Substance, the very same Evangelical Covenant which we Christians enjoy at present; with this only Difference, That it is now more largely explain'd.
- II. That this Covenant continued in Being, and full Force, throughout the Mosaical Oeconomy, down to our Saviour's Time, as a distinct Covenant from the Legal; while the Jews, after the giving of the Law, lived equally under Both.
- III. That Circumcision was the proper Seal and initiatory Ordinance to the Patriarchal, or Gospel Covenant, not to the Legal; and rather signed the Spiritual Seed of Abraham than his Natural. And,
- IV. I shall shew, How the Right which Infants have to be admitted into the Church and Evangelical Covenant, by the proper Ordinance, results from the Premises.
- I. I am to prove, That the Covenant which God made with Abraham and his Seed, was, in Substance, the very same Evangelical Covenant which we Christians enjoy at present; with this only Difference, That it is now more largely explain'd. A Truth so manifest from the Nature of the Covenant, and so clearly attested by the Word of God, that none of our Adversaries, whom I have met with, have the Assurance to deny in express Terms; tho' they have endeavour'd to make it appear a Mix'd or Double Covenant.

Now Covenants receive their Specific Difference from their Nature and Contents, or from the Terms and Conditions on which they run. And there having been in pure Matters of Religion, but

Two

Two Divine Covenants made in general with Mankind, the first was call'd, The Covenant of Works: because it requir'd a perfect Obedience in Man to his Maker's Laws, in order to Life and Justification. And it is styled also, The Old Covenant, by reason it preceded the other; it being given to Adam and his Off-spring in his innocent State, and is now antiquated also by the Covenant of Grace, to all that lead true Evangelical Lives. Wherefore, the Conditions of the First being broken, the Second and New Covenant succeeded, which had its Commencement foon after the Fall. And it is call'd, The Covenant of Grace, both because it was an eminent Act of Favour in God to vouchsafe it to an apostatized Generation of Men, and because it receives 'en to Mercy again, upon the most gracious and equitable Terms that the All-wise Governor of the World could give, or they, in Reason, defire to have. This founds the true and effential Difference between the Two Covenants, and not only fome particular and inferior Promifes they may contain. For in Covenants, Obligations and Duties are to be confidered, as well as the Bleffings and Benefits that are therein stipulated for. And if the promifed Blessings are of different Kinds, the Greatest must carry the Precedency from the Least, and prevail to give Denomination to the Covenant.

But it we take Obligations and Blessings together in this Account, we shall find both, in the Abrahamical Covenant, to be chiefly Spiritual and Evangelical. For the Patriarch and his Seed, were bound thereby to a Spiritual Service, and they had Spiritual and Eternal Blessings insur'd unto them for their Reward. On God's Part, Christ Jesus, with all Gospel Grace and Happiness, were covenanted for; and on Man's Part, Faith and a sincere Obedience. To Abraham, therefore, in that Covenant, it was thus promised; That God would be a God to bim, and to his Seed after him to all Generations;

That

That he should be the Father of many Nations; and. That in his Seed all the Families of the Earth should be blessed. These Promises may be seen in Gen. xvii. and elsewhere; which yet could never be verified, if they ingag'd only for Temporal Bleffings, and extended no further than to the fingle Nation of the Hebrews. But of these general Heads the Holy Ghost is the best Interpreter; who teaches us, That by them God did preach the Gospel unto Abraham; Gal. iii. 8. and promised Christ unto him, v. 16. and, That this Covenant was confirmed of God in Christ, v. 17. the Foundation of it being laid, and the Ratification made, in the Shedding of his precious Blood. And that good God, who ingag'd by Covenant to give his Son to die for Abraham and his Seed, how should he not with him also freely give them all things necessary to Salvation? As Remission of Sin, or Justification by Faith, Gal. iii. 8. Rom. iv. 11. the Adoption of Sons, Grace to serve God acceptably, and the Inheritance of everlasting Life. What more have we Christians? Or are not these the Sum and Compendium of Gospel Mercies? So the principal Bleffings promifed in the Patriarchal Covenant, were purely Spiritual, Evangelical and Eternal.

Likewise, the Obligations and Duties to which Abraham and his Seed were bound by Covenant, were of a Moral and Spiritual Nature, like those that are now incumbent on the Church of Christ. For, according to the Tenor of it, not only Abraham was injoyn'd to walk before God and be perfest, Gen. xvii. 1. but all the Circumcised Seed initiated into this Covenant, were tyed to the Circumcision of the Heart, whereof the outward Ordinance was symbolical. Always did it import to them, That they should mortify the carnal Affections, and put off the Body of the Lusts of the Flesh, Col. ii. 11. and be thereby wrought into true Obedience to the Will of God.

God. And upon the Mystical Signification of this Rite, they are commanded, to circumcife the Fore-Skin of their Heart, and to be no more stiff-necked, Deut. x. 16. Which is repeated Fer. iv. 4. So that Circumcifion, according to its spiritual Meaning and Intention, oblig'd all that receiv'd it in their Flesh, to a spiritual Worship and Obedience in their Soul. But, by reason this could not be performed without the regenerating and fanctifying Grace of God, even this Grace is made fure by Covenant-Promise to the circumcised Seed of Abraham. The Lord thy God will circumcife thine Heart, and the Heart of thy Seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine Heart, and with all thy Soul, that thou mayest live, Duet. xxx. 6. Exactly so it ever was, and will be, under the gracious Covenant of the Gospel. Duty in the Soul and Spirit is commanded, and the Divine Assistance promis'd, that, by a joynt Concurrence of both, the Work of Religion may go on fuccessfully. Make ye a new Heart and a new Spirit, is their Duty, Ezek. xviii. 31. And yet this is what God himself undertakes to do in their behalf by his gracious Operations on their Soul, Chap. xi. 19, 20. and Chap. xxxvi. 26, 27.

Thus the Blessings and Benefits, the Duties and Obligations of the Abrahamical Covenant, were Spiritual and Evangelical, as they are expounded to our Hands by Moses, the Prophets, and St. Paul. And Abraham, tho' he bore not the Name, was, in Realility, as much a Christian, as Believers are fince the Incarnation of God's Son. For he saw the Day of Christ, and rejoyced in the Sight, his Saviour being revealed and insured to him by a Covenant-Promise; and he embracing the Promise by a firm and obedient Faith. And the same, in a due Proportion, holds true of the other Patriarchs and righ-

teous Men of his Race, Heb. xi. 13.

What Mr. Tombs and his Followers have objected against this, amounts to no more, than to urge, "That there are Temporal Blessings promised in the Patriarchal Covenant; as, The Land of Canaan for an Inheritance to Abraham's Posterity; The Birth of Isaac; and Deliverance from Egypt. "Therefore, the Covenant could not be purely "Spiritual and Evangelical, but was a double Covenant, or of a mix'd Nature." But these Temporal Promises, when ballanc'd against the Spiritual, can make no manner of Counter-poize, and are of no Moment in the Comparison. Still, therefore, the most worthy and excellent Promises, or Blessings, ought to give Name unto the Covenant. But I answer farther.

1. If Temporal Promifes contained in the Covenant, change its Nature from being purely Spiritual, into Mix'd, then, I think, it may be justly question'd, Whether the Church of God has ever enjoy'd a Covenant that was purely Spiritual? I am certain, we Christians enjoy it not; which suffices for my purpose, to set the Patriarchal on the same Level with our own. For Temporal Promises are comprized within the Limits of the Gospel Charter. Such as, Blessed are the Meek, for they shall inherit the Earth, Matth. v. 5. Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his Righteousness, and all those Things, i. e. Necessaries for the present Life, shall be added unto you, Matth. vi. 33. For Godliness bath Promise of the Life that now is, and of that which to come, I Tim. iv. 8. More may be seen, Mark x. 29, 30. Luke xii. 28, and xxi. 18. Ephes. vi. 2, 3. Heb. xiii. 5, 6. I Pet. iii. 10, 11, 13. Either, therefore, this mighty Argument must be dropp'd, or else, that very Gospel-Covenant which Christ in Person preach'd, must be longer counted purely Spiritual.

2. The Promise of the Land of Canaan made to Abraham in the Covenant, was not to receive its Accomplishment in his Time, nor in the Time of his Posterity, for the full space of Four hundred and thirty Years to come. But he and the other Patriarchs confess'd themselves to be Strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth, Heb. xi. 13. Or in the promised Land, where they had no Inheritance, so much as to set their foot upon, Acts vii. 5. except a Spot or two of purchas'd Ground, in which their Dead were buried. But in that Interval, they had an Entail of a contrary Nature to Ease and Affluence, in a Land that flowed with Milk and Honey. For, in giving the Covenant, God tells Abram; Know for a furety, that thy Seed shall be a Stranger in a Land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall af-flist them Four hundred Years, Gen. xv. 13. So the Patriarchs with their Families, which were then the Church of God, had, for that Space of Time, no Benefit to expect by Possession from the promised Land of Canaan; but their Covenant was as good as stript of all Temporal Enjoyment. And, therefore, if this Confideration be of any Weight, their Covenant was more purely Spiritual unto them, than it is to us. Yet is it the State of the Church within that Interval, (which we affert to be purely Evangelical, because it was without Mixture of Legal Appendages, and Mosaic Institutions) from whence we take our Pattern for the Forming of Church-Membership, and derive the Lawfulness, if not the Duty, of initiating Infants into the Church and Covenant.

3. In Deut. v. 2, 3. Moses acquaints the Children of Israel, The Lord our God made a Covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this Covenant with our Fathers, but with us, even with us, who are all of us here alive this Day. He undoubtedly means the Legal Covenant, and affures the Israelites, that it was made with them only, who were there present and

alives

alive. Not, therefore, with their Fathers, Abraham, Ifaac and Facob. Then must the Covenant made with those Fathers, be, in its whole Nature, a distinct and different Covenant from the Legal. Whence it sellows, by the clearest Consequence, That since the Covenant made with Abraham was not the Legal, it must necessarily be the pure Evangelical Covenant, because there were no more than those Two. And so, if Moses be allowed to understand the Nature and Difference of the Covenants better than Mr. Tombs, he has utterly overthrown his Argument.

Grounding my self on these Reasons, I conceive, it is sully prov'd, that the Abrahamical Covenant was a purely Spiritual and Evangelical Covenant, or the same in Substance with that which the Chri-

stian Church has always lived under.

II. I am next to prove, That this Covenant continued in Being and full Force throughout the Mosaical Oeconomy, down to our Saviour's Time, as a distinct Covenant from the Legal; while the Jews, after the giving of the Law, lived equally under Both. Upon Adam's Fall, the Evangelical Covenant was first made and publish'd to Mankind, there being no Room nor Occasion for it in their State of Innocency. To Abraham it was repeated in plainer Terms, ratified by an external Seal, and made the Privilege of a peculiar People. Nor had the Church any other Covenant beside this, 'till That of the Law was super-induc'd. Then the Fews, with their Pro-felytes of Righteousness, were brought under Two diflinct Covenants, The Evangelical, and the Legal. Neither could these Two Covenants ever coalesce and unite in One, because of the irreconcileable Opposition between their Natures; nor ought they to be confounded by Authors, as, I think, they have too commonly been in their Accounts of the Judaic Church and Dispensation. Now, that the Evangelical Covenant

nant made with Abraham continued in Force, when the Legal commenc'd, and from thence down to our Saviour's Time, will appear by the following Arguments.

For, 1. After the Legal Covenant of Works was proclaim'd and establish'd with the Fews on Mount Sinai, we find Moses, in God's Name, making another Covenant with them; which could be nothing but the Renewal, or Continuation, of the Patriarchal Covenant of Grace. For thus we read Deut. xxix. 1. These are the Words of the Covenant, which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the Children of Israel in the Land of Moab, BESIDE the Covenant which he made with them in Horeb (which was one of the Summits of Mount Sinai). Commentators do generally interpret this Covenant in the Land of Moab, to be only a Repetition of the Sinai Covenant. But with what Propriety of Speech, or Probability of Truth, the Contents of the Covenant, and the Letter of the Text, declare, which must be forcibly. strained from its Genuine Sense, and Grammatical Construction, before it can bear with their Interpre-For if the Covenant in Moab was a Covenant Beside that in Horeb, as the Original imports, and all the Versions I have seen do so render. it, it is then impossible it should be the Same, because the Idiom and Manner of Expression, will not admit of that Sense. For the Word BESIDE, is added and joyn'd to the Covenant itself, to fignify. its real Difference and Distinction; not to the Promulgation of the Covenant, to denote only its Re-To promife, or give a Thing BESIDE another, shews the Thing to be quite different from the other; whereas, to promise, or convey the same. Thing a thousand times over, makes no Alteration in the Thing itself.

Also, if we consider the Contents, and particular Expressions used in this Covenant, that was made in the Land of *Moab*, they will evince its Distinction

from

from the Legal. I have prov'd before, from Deut. v. 2, 3. That the Covenant made with the Fews in Horeb, was not the Covenant made with Abraham and the Fathers. But this Covenant made with the Jews in Moab, appears to be the same that was made with the Fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Facob. For thus the Terms of it expresly run there, Deut. xxix. 12, 13. as Moses tells the Collective Body of the Fews and Strangers: That thou shouldest enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his Oath which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this Day: That he may establish thee to Day for a People to himfelf; and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath Said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy Fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. And so, if this Covenant made with the Jews in Moab, was the fame which God sware to Abraham and the Fathers, as the Words import, it could not be the Legal Covenant of Works, but the Evangelical Covenant of Grace and Mercy. Moreover, it contains the fame Spiritual Blessings with those that were covenanted for to Abraham. For here the Lord promises to be a God to the Jews and their Seed, as he had promifed to Abraham in the Covenant of Grace, and fign'd it by Circumcision, Gen. xvii. 7. When God expresses himself thus to Men, in the way of Promise and special Favour, it signifies to them some eminent Bleffing; which, in the present Case, must be spiritual, because, in parallel Places, it is so intended and understood. In Exod. iii. 6. God from the Bush declares to Moses, I am the God of thy Father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. To which he adds, v. 15. This is my Name for ever, and this my Memorial to all Generations. From those Words to Moses, our Saviour deduces that spiritual and eternal Bleffing, the Resurrection from the Dead, in his Refutation of the Sadducees, Matt. xxii. 32. And after him, St. Paul B 2 teaches

teaches, That the the Promise to be their God, implied a heavenly Inheritance to the Patriarchs, while in this World they were left destitute of a Possession. For, as Strangers and Pilgrims on Earth, they fought and defired a better Country, that is a heavenly. Wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he hath provided for them a City, Heb. xi. 16. And that the Phrase we speak of, had a peculiar Relation to the Graces and spiritual Bleffings of the Evangelical Covenant, we learn farther from his own Mouth, Fer. xxxi. 33. where, expressing the Terms of the Gospel Covenant, in Opposition to the Legal, he thus promises and declares: I will put my Law in their inward Parts, and write it in their Hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my People. If possible it was to mistake their Meaning, St. Paul prevents it by transcribing the Words, with those adjoyning, and making them to comprehend the Sum of Spiritual and Evangelical Bleffings, Heb. viii. 10. The same Sense they must have Rev. xxi. 3. and in feveral other Places where they occur. How poor and cavilling therefore is the Sophistry of some of our Antagonists, who, striving with all their Might to misrepresent the Abrahamical Covenant, would fain persuade their Readers, that the Promise, I will be a God to thee, and thy Seed after thee, Gen. xvii. 7. doth figuify no more of a spiritual Blessing, than that Preface does at the Giving of the fiery Law which produced Wrath, I am the Lord thy God, Exod. xx. 1? Whereas the Difference is plain and palpable. For this is no Promise of future Favour and Benevolence, but a folemn Declaration of God's Sovereignty and Dominion, which over the Fews he had particularly acquir'd by their Redemption out of Egypt, in order to oblige them to Obedience.

To clear this Point farther; The Covenant made in the Land of *Moab*, contain'd an express Promise of Grace unto the *Jews*; and so must be the Evan-

gelical

gelical Covenant made with Abraham, not the Legal on Mount Sinai, which expressly ingag'd for no such Gift. For the Words and Terms of that Covenant, are continued to the End of Deut. Chap. xxx. In the 6th Verse whereof, Moses tells them, in God's Name; The Lord thy God will circumcise thine Heart, and the Heart of thy Seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine Heart, and with all thy Soul, that thou mayest live. That this can be done only by the inward fanctifying Grace of God's Spirit, proper to the Gospel Covenant, and is the Spiritual Circumcision of the Heart intimated by the Carnal, is acknowledg'd and maintain'd by all Orthodox Christians. And whosoever carefully peruses that xxxth. Chapter, he will see, That the Obedience to the Laws of God there requir'd, must proceed from an internal Principle that affects and converts the Soul, but

must not be slight and superficial.

Once more; In the Covenant made in the Land of Moab, Evangelical Faith is compriz'd; or the Word of Faith, and the Preaching of Faith, as it stands opposite to the Law of Mose's. Whence it undeniably follows, that it cannot be the same with the Legal Covenant made in Horeb. My Observation I raise from the Words in Chap. xxx. 10, &c. which thus conclude: The Word is very nigh thee, in thy Mouth, and in thy Heart, (the very same Expresfion we found in Feremiab concerning the Tenor of the Gospel Covenant) that thou mayest do it. which Passage let St. Paul again be the Expositor; who, quoting that Place in Deuteronomy, and oppofing the Words to the Mosaical Law, affirms them to be the Language of the Righteousness which is by Faith, Rom. x. 5,6. And rehearing in particularthose Expressions, as the Language of Faith; The Word is nigh thee, even in thy Mouth, and in thy Heart; he adds his Comment, That is, the Word of Faith which we preach, v. 8. Wherefore an Evangelical Covenant of Grace and

and Faith the fews had, as given in the Land of Moab,

beside the Legal Covenant on Mount Sinai.

2. If the Evangelical Covenant of Grace was discontinu'd to the fews, during the Term of the Legal Covenant of Works, it will be hard, if not impossible, to account for their Service and Salvation. For, did the Legal Covenant promise to Supply them with the Divine Affistance for these Ends? Or could they pray and hope for it with Faith, when they had no Promise? No Covenant-Right had they to Grace, nor Grounds to expect it in this Case, except they could spring alone from Natural Religion. Yet for Grace they faithfully pray'd with good Success; whereof, to name no more, David's Prayer is a fignal Instance, Pf. li. 10. 11, 12. And by Grace and Faith did righteous Men live in their Church, please God, and obtain the Crown of eternal Life. But this could never be by virtue of the Legal Covenant. For, as we learn from the New Testament, The Law was weak thro' the Flesh, and made nothing perfect. 'Twas establish'd upon Promises inferior to those of Grace and everlasting Felicity; the Blessings it directly promis'd, being only Temporal; 'twas a killing Letter, not a quickning Spirit, and subjected People to a Curse; 'twas the Ministration of Death and Condemnation, because it occasionally increased Sins by the Imposition of heavy Burdens and difficult Duties, where there was not Strength proportionable for their Discharge; and so it wrought Wrath, deceiv'd and flew its Subjects, but fav'd them not. The Spirit came not by the Works of the Law, but by the Hearing of Faith; such Gospel-Faith as Moses preach'd, when he deliver'd the Covenant of Grace in the Land of Moab. Full was the Law of carnal Ordinances, beggarly Elements and Rudiments of the World; which must be all punctually kept, or there was no Justification unto Life: So that, according

cording to its Tenor, no Man could possibly serve . God in such a spiritual Manner, as was requisite to Acceptance and Salvation. For, by the Deeds of the Law shall no Flesh be justified in God's Sight. Wherefore, by the Legal Covenant, consider'd as fuch only, the Fews were all condemn'd and dead Men; because, in its Account, they were all destituted and abandon'd Sinners, without Power from Above to perform their Duty, and gain Approbation with their God. Except, then, we were minded to turn rank Pelagians, we must of necessity grant, that throughout the whole Time of their Legal Difpensation, they were also under a better Covenant, that administred unto them spiritual Succours to serve God faithfully; or else were all eternally lost. And if so, their being God's peculiar People, chosen and beloved above other Nations, would have been a most unhappy and mortifying Confideration, and plainly contradictory in itself. Better, of the two, had it been for them, to be thrown out of that Relation, and permitted, like the Gentiles, to feel after God in the way of Natural Religion, as he might be found, than be clogg'd with Ceremonies to multiply Sins, and confin'd to a Covenant that must condemn them. But with many excellent Livers was their Church adorn'd from Time to Time, who ferv'd God from the Soul and Spirit, and were received by him into eternal Glory. From whence I conclude, That they were not under a Covenant of Works and Wrath, of Condemnation and Death, alone; but also under the Evangelical Covenant of Grace, Mercy, and a Spiritual Life, made to the Fathers, and renewed in the Land of Moab, which impos'd practicable Conditions of Salvation, and afforded Power for acceptable Performance. And as our Chancery is to the Statute Law, fo was this Covenant, as a Court of Equity, to relieve the distressed fews under the rigid Law of Works. For, B 4 3. As

3. As by the Gospel Representations of their State, we find the Fews, under the Old Testament, utterly lost by the Legal Covenant; so we find, all righteous and good Livers among them fav'd by the gracious Covenant of their Fathers. Fews those holy Men were, not only outwardly in the Flesh and Letter, but inwardly in the Heart and Spirit; and the true Circumcision they were, as we Christians are described, to worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, without reposing their Considence in the Flesh, Phil. iii. 3. And what they actually were, the rest of their Church might have been, as they were bound in Duty; forasimuch as suffi-cient Grace was ingag'd unto them by a sure Covenant: For the Gospel was preach'd to them as it is to us, Heb. iv. 2. not in the Types and Shadows of the Law only, but in plainer Language. St. Paul thus enumerates their Spiritual Privileges and Condition, Rom. ix. 4. Who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the Service of God; whose are the Fathers. According to God's Purpose, spiritual and true Israelites they ought and might have been: The Adoption was theirs, not to be Slaves under the Yoke of Bondage, but to be the Regenerate Off-spring of their heavenly Father. Theirs was the Glory of God's Presence in the Shechinah and in the Spirit. Theirs the Law, Moral and Spiritual, as well as Ritual; for Holy and Spiritual, Just and Good it was, Rom. vii. 12, 14. as they had it in the Covenant of their Fathers, continued to them in the Land of Moab. Theirs the Service of God; both exterior, in Ordinances, and interior, in the Heart. Theirs the Fathers, in whom their chief Interest should have been, by a spiritual Regeneration, to follow their Pattern, that they might be their True Children, and enjoy their Privileges.

Privileges. And theirs the Covenants, in the Plural Number, which are call'd, The Covenants of Promise, Eph. ii. 12. The Legal, with its Temporal Promises, and the Evangelical, with those that are Spiritual and Eternal. So St. Peter tells them, Acts iii. 25. Te are the Children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our Fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy Seed shall all the Kindreds of the Earth be blessed. If Children of that Covenant they and their Predecessors were, they were its Subjects also, and in the Right or Possession of its Privileges. And, finally, Christ was theirs in a special Manner, as born of their Nation, to be King of the Jews, and the Saviour of his People Israel. A Right, therefore, they had to all Graces and spiritual Blessings, had they strove to make good their Right; which shows, what Cove-

nant they were always under.

Clouded, indeed, and cumber'd it was, by the Addition of the Legal, with its numerous Ceremonies; fo that, to vulgar Capacities, it might lie out of Sight, and be, in Appearance, loft. But wife and holy Men had an illuminated Mind, that faw thro' the Clouds to Christ Jesus, who was the End of the Law, Rom. x. 4. or the Completion of it. for Righteousness to every one that believeth. Nor did they forget their Interest in that gracious Covenant of their Fathers, which preached Christ unto them. with all his Benefits. For, living by Faith, they did all eat of the same spiritual Meat, and did all drink of the same spiritual Drink: For they drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them; and that Rock was Christ, I Cor. x. 3, 4. And through Faith they all obtained a good Report, though they received not the Promise; God having provided for us some better Thing, that they without us should not be made perfect, Heb. xi. 39, 40. To the first Fathers, the Promises of Christ and Heaven were afar off, ver. 13.; to the later

later Fews, they gradually drew nearer: But accomplish'd they were not, before the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord; nor will they sully be, 'till we are all instated in the Kingdom of Glory. These Things the Old Saints foresaw by Faith in God's Promises. For Christ was a Minister of the Circumcision, to confirm the Promises made unto the Fathers, Rom. xv. 8. Because in him alone they are sulfill'd, and receive their Consummation.

4. As the Legal Covenant, precifely confider'd. promis'd no supernatural Assistance to keep the Law. fo it expresly promis'd no eternal Reward in Heaven to its exactest Keepers; but a prosperous Abode in the Land of Canaan, was all it directly ingaged for in their Behalf. The Covenant of Grace is establish'd on better Promises, Heb. viii. 6.; such are, The Help of God's Spirit to live religiously, Pardon of Sins, from which they could not be justified by the Law. of Moses, Acts xiii. 39. and, above all, eternal Bliss in Heaven, whereby it became an Introduction to a better Hope, Heb. vii. 19. If, therefore, the Fews were under no other Covenant beside the Legal, how could their righteous Men expect, with Faith, the Inheritance of eternal Life for their Reward? Was it their native Right? or, Could they claim it, in their lapsed State, by a Covenant of Works? Surely, they could never believe and hope for it, without a free Promise by the Covenant of Grace made with their Fathers, and perpetuated to them in all Ages. Yet this Hope and Faith they constantly entertain'd, knowing, that, by the Patriarchal Covenant, God had bound himself to be their God, an exceeding great Reward. Purfuant to which Obligation, they trusted he would raise them up from their Graves to the Fruition of Himself in Heaven. Before the Law, Moses bore the Reproach of Christ; for he had a Refped to the Recompence of the Reward, Heb. xi. 26. Under the Law, they still retained the same Expechation:

Etation: For now, fays St. Paul, Alls xxvi. 6, 7. I stand and am judged for the Hope of the Promise made to our Fathers; unto which Promise our Twelve Tribes. instantly serving God Night and Day, hope to come. And what was that promised Hope, but the Resurrection to eternal Life, as the next Verse points it out? Why should it be thought a Thing incredible with you, that God should raise the Dead? And for the Hope and Resurrection of the Dead was he called in Question, Chap. xxiii. 6. More plainly yet, Chap. xxiv. 15. I have Hopes towards God, which the Jews themselves allow, that there shall be a Resurrestion both of the Fust and Unjust. For this was taught by the Law and the Prophets, Ver. 14. and by Moses and the Prophets, Chap. xxvi. 22. Because Moses. when he had given the Law, did also, in the Land of Moab, preach the Gospel to the Fews; and both Covenants, with their respective Bleffings, are contained in the same Code, or Books of the Law. Upon which Foundation, their holy Men patiently indured the most exquisite Tortures, not accepting Deliverance, that they might obtain a better Resurrection, Heb. xi. 35. So from I Macch. vii. it appears, that they had a firm Belief and Prospect into a Future State; which Fosephus also testifies to be their Faith. And of their principal Sect, the Pharifees, it is recorded, That they professed a Resurrection from the Dead, Ads xxiii. 8. Not to mention Dan. xii. 2, 3. Wherefore, this Faith and Hope deriving not from the Spirit of the Law, which gave them no certain Grounds for such Dependance; I conceive, it must needs derive from the Evangelical Covenant made with Abraham, and continued to the Fews with the Legal.

5. St. Paul, Gal. iii. 17. teaches, That the Covenant which was confirm'd before of God in Christ, the Law (which was Four hundred and thirty Years after) could not disannul, that it should make the

Promise of none effect. That Covenant was the Abrahamical; which if it neither was, nor could be disanull'd by the Law, it must, with the Law, remain in Force. Else, to be suspended, superseded, or removed out of the way for the space of Fisteen or Sixteen Centuries, while the Law continued, was no less than to be cancell'd, disannull'd, and made of none effect during all that Time; which the Apostle denies the Law to have done, or to be in its Power. If thro'out that Interval, the Promise remained in Force, the Covenant must, which grounded the Promise.

So the Jews lived under Two distinct Covenants while the Legal Dispensation lasted. And if in this Opinion I am singular, I must still continue of this Mind, 'till I see it prov'd erroneous. Then I promise readily to retract, and submit to the better Judgment of the Learned; who, as far as my Knowledge reaches, have hitherto, with little or no Exception, gone against me in a Body, and cast

their Schemes in another Model.

III. The Third Point to be proved, is, That Circumcission was the proper Seal and initiatory Ordinance to the Patriarchal, or Gospel Covenant, not to the Legal; and rather sign'd the Spiritual Seed of Abra-

ham, than his Natural. For,

1. When the Sacrament of Circumcifion was first instituted, there was no Covenant with the Church of God in Being, beside the Evangelical; no Mosaical Law on foot for Four hundred and thirty Years after, neither signified nor intended, except in God's secret Counsel, upon Foresight of the fews untractable Temper. Not a Syllable is mentioned, or hinted, concerning the Law and Legal Covenant, when the Gospel Covenant, sign'd by Circumcision, was given to Abraham, nor any where else before the fews Rebellions in the Wilderness: Therefore, Circumcision, in its proper and primitive Design, could

not be instituted, as a Legal Rite, to fign the Covenant of Works, which had no Existence at that Time, nor above Four Centuries after, nor was at all known to the Church of God. For it is an approved Maxim in Philosophy, Non Entis, nulle funt Affectiones; What has no Being, has no Qualities, Properties, or Affections. Circumcifion could. therefore, have no relation to a future, unknown Law, given to Posterity on Mount Sinai, and which God Hinsfelf intended not to give, but on Supposition. For, certainly, He would not ordain a Sacrament fo long before, to feal a Covenant that was no where extant then in Nature, nor appoint an initiatory Rite to enter Men into it, when he gave them not the least Notice or Intimation of it beforehand. Wherefore, Circumcifion must be a Ceremony that originally fign'd the pure Covenant of Grace, which alone existed at its Institution; as it fign'd to Abraham the Righteousness of Faith, which he had, being yet uncircumcifed.

2. At the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, the Fews were not circumcifed, nor initiated by that Ordinance into its Profession and Obedience; but all the People that were circumcifed, were circumcifed before in Egypt (without mention of the Law) to the Evangelical Covenant, which they and their Fathers had always lived under from the Days of Abraham. For, at the Promulgation of the Law, no mention was made of that Ceremony as the Covenanting Ordinance, neither were the People circumcised 'till about Forty Years after, when they had finish'd their Travels, pass'd over fordan, and fossum, by God's Command, gave Order for the Personal Command formance of that Rite, Fosh. v. 2, &c. So that it was not done by the proper Legislator of the Legal Covenant. And then, also, there was not the least Intimation given of it, as a Rite that enter'd them into that Covenant, and bound them to the Observa-

tion of its Precepts; but only, that God thereby rolled from them the Reproach of Egypt, Ver. 9. or removed the Infamy of their being uncircumcifed, like other Nations that were out of Covenant, and visibly undistinguish'd from them by his own Badge and Character, nor appropriated to himself by that facred Ordinance, as his Church and peculiar People. Nay, and I dare positively affirm, That it is no where implied in the Old Testament, that Circumcifion was a Rite intended by God to initiate Persons into the Legal Covenant, and oblige them to the Observance of its Conditions. If this be true, as I am fatisfied it is, what bold Presumption must it be in our Adversaries, to endeavour to face us down with positive Asseverations, That Circumcision was a pure Legal Rite, which sign'd the Covenant of Works, when the Scripture makes it God's Ordinance to fign the Covenant of Grace alone; but is perfectly filent, throughout the whole Judaic Oeconomy, of any respect it bore to the Mosaical Law, as a diftinct Covenant from that of Abraham? They who profess to believe and admit of nothing about positive Ordinances, but what they receive from clear Scripture-Evidences, do herein act very partially and inconfistently with their Pretenfions. What they alledge for their purpose out of the New Testament, shall be considered hereafter.

Circumcission did not only sign Abraham's Natural Seed, that descended from his Loyns, but Strangers also, who were thereby mark'd as Proselytes to his Religion, and made his Spiritual Seed, tho' they never issued from his Bowels. For this is God's Order, Gen. xvii. 12, 13, 14. He that is Eight Days old shall be circumcised among you, every Man Child in your Generations, he that is born in the House, or bought with Money of any Stranger, which is not of thy Seed; he that is born in thy House, and he that is bought with thy Money, must needs be circumcised;

and my Covenant shall be in your Flesh for an everlasting Covenant. And the uncircumcised Man Child, whose Flesh of his Foreskin is not circumcised, that Soul shall be cut off from his People; he hath broken my Covenant. Here were more than Abraham's Natural Seed within the Covenant, and intitled to its Privileges by Circumcision; so that their Assertion is notoriously false, who affirm, That Rite was ordain'd to distinguish his Natural Seed from Strangers.

No less false and absurd it is to affirm. That Circumcifion made those Strangers to be Members of Abraham's Family; which seems to suggest, that it made them not Members of the Church. But did these exact Textuaries, who pretend to hold so close to Scriptural Accounts, learn this Doctrine from the Holy Bible? Where have they least Support for their Chimerical Notion in all that Book? Or is it indeed credible, that God's main Concern was to bring Servants into Abraham's House by a Divine Covenant, under the Penalty of Excision: and that his Providence was more imploy'd to fill up the Families of Men, than his own Church? But it falls out unluckily for our Adversaries Cause, that the Strangers then circumcifed, were already Members of Abraham's Family; and how could they be made by Circumcifion what they were before? for in that Quality they were circumcis'd, v. 27. Three hundred and eighteen domestic Servants had Abraham before that Time, that were born in his House, and could bear Arms, Gen. xiv. 14. And, it is like, their Numbers in the Interim were increas'd thro' God's Blessing upon the Patriarch. What now did Circumcifion add to their State in a Civil Respect, seeing they were already his Servants, and Members of his Family? Did it thenceforth make them Freemen, or adopt them for his Sons and Heirs? This it is to trifle with the Scriptures and God's Ordinances ?

The Truth is, They were Men of the same Religion with himself. For it is utterly improbable the holy Patriarch, or any of his Race next enfuing, would entertain a Set of Infidels, or Idolaters, in their domestic Service, without teaching them better things. Particularly, in regard to Abraham, this could never agree with that glorious Character and Testimony which God himself gives to his faithful Friend, Gen. xviii. 19. I know Abraham, that he will command bis Children, (Ishmael therefore, and the Sons of Keturah, as well as Isaac) and his Houshold after him. (the Servants belonging to his Family) and they Shall keep the Way of the Lord, to do Fustice and Judgment, and that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him: Namely, That all the Nations of the Earth should be bleffed in him, v. 18. This indeed speaks of Futurity; but who can think Abraham had neglected fuch a necessary Duty for the Time aforegoing? Ishmael then being Thirteen Years old, and pioufly educated, and the Men of Abrabam's House in adult Age, when they were circumcifed, had, in kind, the fame Righteousness, or Justification of Faith, that Abraham had, which was equally feal'd by that Ordinance of Circumcifion to them All; as likewise to the sincere Proselytes in the Times following.

For these Proselytes the Law of God did afterwards make this Provision, Exod. xii. 48, 49. When a Stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the Passover of the Lord, let all his Males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the Land: for no uncircumcised Person shall eat thereof. One Law shall be to him that is home-born, and to the Stranger that sojourneth among you. By this Law, both the Adult Persons that were proselyted, and their Male-Insants, were to be alike circumcised with the Native Fews, and thereupon admitted into religious Communion.

Some-

Sometimes vast multitudes of Proselytes accrew'd to the Church by the Benefit of this Mosaical Law, and that to Abraham. I omit the Shechemites, because the Sons of Jacob, without their Father's Knowledge, fraudulently intended to make 'em Sacrifices to their Resentments for the Rape of Dinah. rather then Profelytes to God by Circumcifion. But, probably, among these Proselytes were that mix'd Multitude, who, struck with Astonishment and Conviction by the Wonders they faw in Egypt, followed the Camp of Ifrael, and might joyn them-felves to the People of God, Exod. xii. 38. And so they, or their Children, might be circumcifed with the Jews in Gilgal. For into the Covenant of Grace those Strangers were admitted, Deut. xxix. 11. Of this fort also were the Gibeonites, who were made Servants in the House of God, even Hewers of Wood and Drawers of Water for the Altar of the Lord, in the Place which he should chuse, Joshua ix. 27. To which Offices they had never been promoted, except they had renounc'd Idolatry, and given in their Names to the God of Israel, as Masius observes there on Ver. 22, 23. For such Ministers were included in the Covenant of Grace, as we find the Hewers of Wood and Drawers of Water were, Deut. xxix. 11. tho' perhaps, these last had no other than Civil Employments. But in the fuccessive Reigns of David and Solomon, so numerous and frequent were the Profelytes, that the Church was backward to receive them, upon Suspicion, that the victorious Arms of the Father, and the magnificent Splendor of the Son's Court, were the chief Inducements that brought 'em in, rather than the Convictions of their Conscience. In the Reign of Ahasuerus we have Authentic Evidence, That many of the People of his Land became Jews; for the Fear of the Jews fell upon them, Esth. viii. 17. I suppose, we may safely take it on the Credit of Fosephus

That the whole Nation of the Edomites, Esau's Posterity, were proselyted to the Church in the Reign of Hyrcanus; and the Itureans in the Days of his Son Aristobulus. And Mr. Gale from Ganz. a Rabbinical Historian, quotes this Passage: " At " the Year 3670. many great and powerful Cities "became the Allies of Alexander, the Brother of Aristobulus, and were circumcis'd." Circumcision was not, therefore, the discriminating Badge between Abrabam's Natural Seed, and all other Nations in the World; fince abundance of Persons, that were none of his Descendants, were circumcifed, and God was not careful by a Sacred Rite to diffinguish loft and carnal Men, from their Fellow-Reprobates. That Ordinance always accompanied those who were Abraham's Spiritual Seed by Calling and Profession. And tho' it can never be made out, that Ishmael, Esau, and Keturah's Sons, were, in Person, abfolutely and eternally reprobated, yet, if it could be done, they were by Right and Title within the Limits of the Covenant when circumcis'd, because born of faithful Parents. For Privilege still follows Profession and external Evidence, unless it grows fo scandalous as to come actually under the Cenfures of the Law.

In all this Account, as we find that Circumcifion was not appropriated to the Legal Covenant; so we find nothing in the Old Testament importing it to be an Ordinance that entred People into that Covenant, and bound them to the Observation of its Precepts. A Condition it was præ requisite to the Keeping of the Passover, and to religious Communion with the Jewish Church, but no Tie or Obsligation to the Legal Ceremonies. Four hundred and thirty Years it sign'd the Covenant of Grace before the other was in Being, or its Futurity signified by the least Intimation; and in the same Use it continued, according to God's Intent, throughout

the

the whole Mosaical Dispensation. For, Circumcision was not of Moses, but of the Fathers, Joh. vii. 22.

The Law itself, in its positive Institutions, was

no Part of the Patriarchal Covenant; nor defign'd at first to be given as a distinct Occonomy of Religion, but was afterwards occasionally super-induc'd to the former Covenant. And for what Reason? Not to fulfil any previous Promife, or Præ-engagement of God, nor to comply with his own antecedent Purpose; but to chastise the Sins of a refractory People, to tame their Wantonness, and to keep 'em well employ'd at home, that their roving Spirits might not ramble after strange Gods, and strange Religions, for want of full and better Work in their own Church. This Reason St. Paul assigns for its Use and Origin, Gal. iii. 19. Wherefore then serveth the Law? It was added because of Transgressions: To punish former Sins, and prevent'em for the future. And God himself declares, Ezek. xx. 25. that because of their Idolatries and gross Violations of his Moral Precepts, He gave them Statutes that were not good, and Judgments whereby they should not live. And it has been the Opinion of some Learned Men, that if the Fews had not worshipp'd the Golden Calf, and discover'd their incurable Proclivity to other Sins, they had receiv'd no more Precepts than the Ten Commandments. Sacrifices themselves were not the main original Defign of God in his Legislature to those People; Much less other Ritual Ordi-Fer. vii. 22, 23. nances of leffer moment.

Yet tho' the Law was an Expedient to keep them from Idolatry and Trangression, in another respect it multiplied their Sins, by multiplying their Duties, which they were not able to perform. For the Law entred, that the Offence might abound, Rom. v. 20. Which is taught more at large, ch. vii. 8, &c. As, therefore, the Law was only a temporary and oc-

cafional

casional Model of Religion super-added to the Covenant of Grace, so Circumcision, which was originally appropriated to that Covenant, became annex'd to the Legal, as a particular Precept, not as an initiating Ordinance to it. For, whatsoever Regard and Use it had in the Law, it could be no older a Date, than the Law it self; and so was but a secondary and posterior Use, brought in upon Emergency.

But the Fews in After-times, did, of their own Heads, and without Scripture-Warrant, introduce a new Doctrine concerning it into their Church. For they laid a most extravagant Stress on their positive Ordinances. A folemn Rite of Admission into their Church and Legal Oeconomy, and an Obligation to keep its Precepts, they made it to be. And because this was with them a current and prevailing Opinion of fome Standing, St. Paul does but graft upon their Sentiments, when he presses the Judaizing Christians. who entertained still the same Thoughts about this Matter with their unbelieving Countrymen, and fays, Gal. v. 2, 3, 4. Itestify again to every one that is circumcised, that he is a Debtor to do the whole Law; that Christ will prosit him nothing, and is become to him of none Effect; and that he is fallen from Grac. They among Christ's Disciples, whom St. Paul does there dispute against, were of this Persuasion; That the Law must all be kept by circumcis'd Persons, and that both Circumcision and Obedience to the Law. were indispensably necessary to Salvation, Alls xv. 1, 5, 24. and ch. xxi. 20.

But if St. Paul had been himself of this Mind, That Circumcision did, by its intrinsic Use and Nature, necessarily bind to keep the Law, he would never have spoken of Circumcision as of a thing, in itself, so very indifferent and insignificant, as he does soon after, Gal. v. 6. and vi. 15. For it must have avail'd and signified as much as Christ and his saving Grace were worth, if, by God's Design and its

own Nature, it bound to the Observance of the whole Law, and cut off all circumcised Persons from Christ and Grace. Nor would the Apostle, in compliance with some, who, perhaps, were not so deeply and incurably tinctur'd with those Opinions, have yielded to circumcise Timothy, if thereby he must make him such a deplorable Debtor to the Law; when, we know, he refus'd the circumcising of Titus, to humour Men that were posses'd with those Mis-persuasions. And if Circumcision must really have that Meaning and necessary Consequence, what became of those Fisteen Bishops of Ferusalem, with their Flocks, who in the first Centuries were circumcis'd, as we are inform'd by Ecclesiastical History?

All which shews, That St. Paul's different Conduct and Doctrine in that Affair, depended not on the Nature and true Intent of Circumcifion itself, but on the different Opinions, or Tempers, of the Persons he had to deal with, who were oblig'd to act according to their present Judgments. For, as he fays, Rom. xiv. 14. To him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean: So to him that esteemeth any thing to be a Truth, or Duty, to him it is a Truth, or Duty, so long as he remains under those Convictions. Therefore, he argues against those Judaizing Christians only upon their own Principles. For, to Men who had throughly imbib'd such Notions, as to believe Circumcifion was a Bond, to keep the whole Mosaical Law, and that both together were necessary Conditions of Justification to eternal Life, he justly affirms, That they became Debtors to do the whole Law by Virtue of their own Act and Opinions; That they were fallen from Grace; that Christwas become of none Effect to them, and would profit them nothing. Whereas, by God's Appointment, and in its own Nature, Circumcifion had no fuch Use and Signification, either under the Old or New Testament. This, then, is nothing else, but what we call, Ar-C 3 gumentum

gumentum ad hominem, whereby we press our Opponents with Absurdities and Inconveniencies flowing from their own receiv'd, but erroneous Tenets.

And fo I hope this Rub is cleared off.

Would we imitate the Baprists Modesty and laudable Way of Reasoning, I believe, we might, with greater Probability of Truth from God's Word, infer, That Baptism was a Legal Rite, which initiated the Jews into the Profession of the Mosaical Law, and bound 'em to its Obedience, than it is inferr'd, that Circumcision was such a Rite. For, baptiz'd the Jews were unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea; Which is not Rabbinical, but Apostolical Doctrine. 1 Cor. x. 2. Faith was then wrought in their Hearts by the Miracle which they faw; fo that they believed the Lord, and his Servant Moses, Exod. xiv. 31. God's Mouth and Minister extraordinary they thereupon accounted Moses, and to his Commands and Discipline they resign'd, Exod. xix. 8. and xx. 19. and xxiv. 3, 7. and Deut. v. 37. With much better Colour of Truth might we, therefore, affirm, that Baptism oblig'd to the Legal Covenant, than our Adversaries affirm, that Circumcifion did.

And thus Circumcission, tho' it was injoyn'd by a fresh Command of Moses, Lev. xii. 3. and practised in the Judaic Church under the Law, as an antecedent Qualification to the Passover, and, consequently, to religious Communion, remain'd to our Saviour's Days a Seal of the Covenant made with Abrabam, and rather sign'd his Spiritual, than his Natural Seed. For, as the Apostle says, That the Law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, could not disannul the Covenant; so neither could it destroy the Seal, nor divert it to a contrary Use. Else, by taking off the Seal from the proper Covenant, and affixing it to one that was of an opposite Nature, it must, by Consequence, have disannul'd the Covenant.

venant, which is of no Force when stript of its confirming Seal and Ceremony, any more than a Will

or Testament that is unsign'd.

It is now Time to examine Mr. Tombs's Strong Lines and Unanswerable Arguments, as his Seconds call them, to prove Circumcifion to be a pure Legal Rite, that fign'd the Covenant of Works, not of Grace. For Numbers they are somewhat formidable, amounting to about half a Score; but their Strength being already broken, they will be eafily encountred and overthrown. For they are grounded mostly upon the Opposition lying between the Evangelical and Legal Covenant, which St. Paul infifts on in his Epistles. Christ he opposes to Moses, the Gospel to the Law, and the Covenant of Grace to That of Works, strictly and precisely taken as given to the fews on Mount Sinai, and as bound upon them by Circumcifion, according to their own Divinity. But he makes no Opposition between Abraham and Christ, or the Abrahamical Covenant and the Evangelical; between which Two there was always a fair Agreement and Correspondence, or, rather, a Sameness and Identity. If, therefore, the Circumcision of the Flesh is by St. Paul opposed to Christ and Gospel Grace, the Opposition cannot be founded on its primitive Use in figning the Gracious Covenant made with Abraham, this being purely that of the Gospel; but upon a Secondary Use it had a-mong the later *fews* in signing the Legal Covenant, according to their Traditional Doctrine. For since this Use of Circumcision was introduc'd by them in posterior Ages, and the Judaizing Christians expected Justification that way, it was necessary for the Apostle to argue against them upon that Foundation, and undeceive em in their Errors. As this serves for a Key to open St. Paul's Meaning; so the observing of it, will greatly help to overthrow our. Adversaries Arguments urg'd against us, which are to this Effect.

1. They tell us; "The Covenant feal'd by Cir"cumcifion, was not a Covenant of Grace, but " was made to separate the Natural Seed of A-" braham from all other Nations in the World, and

" to insure to them the Possession of the promised " Land." This is refuted before, and needs no

farther Answer.

2. "The Covenant of Grace did not belong to some that were circumcifed; as, not to Ishmael, Esau, and the Sons of Keturah. Which has been also anfwered. For they may as well plead, that Baptism does not initiate into the Covenant of Grace, because it was administred to Judas, as they tell us, to Simon Magus, and to abundance of Persons that prov'd flagitious Sinners, Heretics, Shismatics, Apostates and Reprobates, and therefore fell under the Rebukes

and Censures of Christ's Apostles.

3. The next Argument, as it is call'd, repeats the same Story; "That the Covenant of Circum-" cision was not a Covenant of Grace, because it " belonged to the fleshly and ungodly Seed of A-" braham; as, to Ishmael, &c." After this way of Management, Syllogisms and Arguments, like Abraham's Seed, may become as the Stars in the Sky, and as the Sands on the Sea-shore for Multitude. But all those circumcifed Persons were Children of believing Parents, and, by Presumption, intitled to the Covenant and its Seal. And this is the just Latitude we demand for the Application of the new Seal of Baptism. For if our Antagonists could prove, there were ever so many Reprobates admitted into the Abrahamical Covenant by Circumcifion, they would not prejudice ours, but their own Cause.

4. " All that are in the Covenant of Grace, do " know the Lord, from the greatest of them to the " least, fer. xxxi. 32, 33, 34. But circumcised Infants could not know the Lord; Therefore, Cir-

cumcifion could not be the Covenant of Grace. Neither

" Neither can Infants now know the Lord; and " consequently, they are not in the Covenant of "Grace, nor proper Subjects for Christian Bap-" tism." Adieu then to their Salvation. For if they be not fav'd by the Covenant of Grace, in which they never were, nor can be, may they be fav'd by the Covenant of Works? So that if this Argument proves any thing, it proves a great deal too much, and cannot possibly have any Force. But is is to be noted, that in the same Quotation from the Prophet, these Words occur; And they shall teach no more every Man his Neighbour, and every Man his Brother, Saying, Know the Lord. Let the Baptists put a Construction upon these Words that is agreeable to Their Practice in teaching their baptiz'd Believers, whom they suppose to be in the Covenant of Grace, and we will undertake to answer for the other Words they alledge against us. But, 'till they do that, we are not bound to gratify them in their Cavils, any more than Christ thought himself oblig'd to answer the Priests and Rulers Challenge about his Authority, when he put a Question to 'em about Fohn's Baptism, and they could not answer him. I use not this for a Shift to wave the Objection, which we can eafily remove when we please, but to expose the Folly of the Objectors.

5. Says our Adversary, "Circumcission was a part of the Covenant of Works, binding to the Obser- vation of the Mosaical Law, Gal. v. 3. and so could not be the Covenant of Grace." But this

is already proved to be false.

6. The next Argument afferts, "Circumcifion to be as much the Covenant of Works, as that "made with Adam before the Fall, or the Sinai Co-"venant." But I utterly despair to see the Affertion justified; and 'till that is done, our Word in the Negative, is as good as the Baptists in the Affirmative.

-1 1-90)

7. Notable is Mr. Tombs's next Device, for which he deserves an everlasting Monument: For, savs he, "Circumcifion could not be the Covenant of "Grace, because Abraham was not justified in Cir-" cumcifion, but in Uncircumcifion, Rom. iv. 9, 10." Strong Lines indeed! and unanswerable Arguments! For does it follow, that because Abraham, (and he might have put in Melchisedec, Fob, Lot, and all the Righteous Men that liv'd before) was justified without the Use of a Rite, which was not then ordain'd, no Man is, or can be justified in the Use of it afterwards? Or, That it could not belong to the Covenant of Grace, because Grace might be obtain'd another Way, when that Covenanting Rite was not instituted? Was Circumcifion really incompatible with Justifying and Saving Grace? If fo, what tender Heart should not ake for the circumcised Hebrews, who were all destroyed by that Ordinance? I wish these shrewd Logicians may not at length unanswerably prove, That Baptisin cannot be an Ordinance belonging to the Covenant of Grace, because Abraham, and Thousands more, as we charitably hope, were not justified in Baptisin, but while they were unbaptiz'd. For the Argument does this, as much as the other. 8. "The Law, or Covenant of Circumcifion, being contra-diffinguished and oppos'd by the " Apostle to the Righteousness of Faith, Rom. iv.

8. "The Law, or Covenant of Circumcision," being contra-distinguished and opposed by the Apostle to the Righteousness of Faith, Rom. iv. "12, 13. could not be a Covenant of Faith, or the Gospel Covenant." Very true. But Circumcision, in its primary Use, at least, was an Ordinance of the pure Evangelical Covenant made with Abraham, and if it came to be annexed to the Legal Covenant afterwards, as a binding Initiatory Rite, and in that Sense counted necessary to Justification; it was only in the Opinion of Men, by Virtue of which alone it stood opposite unto Grace. The Law disannull'd not the gracious Covenant made with

Abraham, nor took off its Seal; but both continu'd in Force 'till our Saviour's Time; and had he thought it proper, he might have caucell'd the Law, and retain'd the Seal in its primitive Use. Then had it no more oppos'd Evangelical Grace, except in the erroneous Divinity of Jews and Judaizing Christians, than it did before the Law was given. Men, by their Mis-conceptions, may give a wrong Turn to the Divine Institutions; but the Word and Purpose of God will stand fast.

9. Upon the same Thing does the following Argument turn; "Circumcision impos'd a Yoke of Bon"dage, and could not therefore appertain to the "Covenant of Grace." In the Sense of the laterfews it did so, who thought it oblig'd to the Observation of the whole Mosaical Law, and that both were necessary to Salvation; but never in its own Nature and original Intent, while it always seal'd

the Abrahamical Covenant down to Christ.

"The last Argument is imploy'd, "to banish "Hagar, Ishmael, and the sless from Canaan" and the Church of God, as far as Arabia." And thither let them go, so long as Abraham, with the Evangelical Covenant and spiritual Seed, may stay behind. For I am no Advocate for the Bondwoman and her slavish Children, in the Allegorical Explication or Reddition: I mean, Not for the Law of Moses and the service Church of the Jews, which were typically signified by Hagar and Ishmael; but for the Gospel Church and Covenant, as they were preach'd to Abraham, and sign'd with the Seal of Grace call'd Circumcision.

These are the terrible Arguments of our Adversaries, and if they were never yet answer'd, as some say, I believe the Reason was not because they could not, but because they were not worth it. However, I have accepted the Challenge, and condescended to

please them, tho it might be needless.

I have

I have some few Things more to observe, before I proceed to the Fourth Head.

I. Some of our Antagonists will by no means allow Baptism to be a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, because it is no where called so in Scripture; but the holy Spirit is with Them the only Seal of that Covenant. Yet these same Men do strenuously plead, That Circumcision was a Seal of the Legal Covenant, and a Sign of giving the Law. My Demand upon them is, Where do they find those Terms, or a Tittle of that Dostrine in the Scripture? If the holy Spirit be a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, it is a Seal that is inward and invisible. And was he not always the Seal of that Covenant? For how can Saving Grace be among lapsed Men, where the Spirit of Grace is not? And how also, since the Fall, could the People of God ever be without that Covenant?

But these Gentlemen ought to know, that Things are to receive their Names from their Use and Nafure; or, if positive Rites they be, from the End and Defign of their Institution. Now it is granted on all sides, that Baptism so far succeeds Circumcision, as to be the initiating Ordinance into the Evangelical Church and Covenant, whereby God and Baptized Persons stand mutually engag'd to one another; and this gives it the Use and Nature of a Seal. For by the very Act of Entrance into the Church and Covenant folemnly made on the one fide, and by a prefum'd Acceptance on the other side, the Persons baptiz'd do either expressy in Word, or virtually in Deed, promise Faith and Obedience unto God; and He, by their Admittance in, affures them of the Graces and Bleffings of the Covenant; which he never fails to perform, provided they themselves do not obstruct it. So the Covenant is transacted by Stipulation and Re-stipulation. Then the external visible Rite that is us'd to fignify and confirm the mutual Engagements.

Event

ments, must be counted the proper Seal of that Covenant; it being the Use and Nature of a Seal to confirm and ratify, as it is the Use and Nature of a Sign to fignify. Ever fince God form'd a visible and organiz'd Church to himself in the Days of Abraham, the Covenant was not without a Seal: And why it should not still have such an external Seal, to insure the Persons admitted into it of God's Favour, and diftinguish them from professed Infidels, seems unaccountable; especially, when Christ has appointed a Sacrament as an Initiatory Rite into his Church. which may conveniently serve for that End. Nor is it any material Objection against this Use, that Baptism makes no visible lasting Impression on the Body. as Circumcifion did. For among all the Forms and Ceremonies that God us'd to confirm the Promises of his Covenants; as, The Tree of Life, The Rain-bow, Sacrifices, The Oath of Confirmation, and, if there be any more, That lafting Impression on the Flesh, was peculiar only to Circumcifion.

Of the same Weight is another Objection, which is urg'd to shew, "That neither Circumcission, nor Baptism, could be Seals to the Covenant of Grace, because many graceless Persons have been Partakers of those Ordinances, and God cannot affix his "Seal unto a Lye." What need we observe here, that Covenants are made upon Conditions, which if one Party breaks, the other is discharg'd by the very Nature and Tenor of the Covenant? The Default is always on Mens side. For, let God be true, but every Man a Lyar; and if they deny Him, He is faithful, and cannot deny Himself. To such Covenant-breakers he declares, Te shall know my Breach of Promise, Num. xiv. 34. God's Promises are no less sacred and inviolable, than his Oaths and Seals. Was not that, therefore, a most solemn Promise, which he made by Covenant, of circumcising the Heart of the Jews, and the Heart of their Seed. &c? Deut. xxx. 6. Yet, see the

Event it had thro' their Perverseness: All the House of Israel are uncircumcifed in the Heart, Jer. ix. 26. Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcifed in Heart and Ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your Fathers did.

So do ye, Acts vii. 5 1.

But if what is here said, be not sufficient to satisfy the Baptists, that Baptists is a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, I desire them to be determined by their own Doctrine, which from our Church they have adopted into their Articles of the Christian Faith. Wherein, N°. 27. They affirm, "That by Baptism the Promises of Forgiveness of Sin, and of our Adoption to be the Sons of God by "the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed."

2. In Abraham it was an antecedent, not a subsequent Fith, or Righteousness by Faith, that was feal'd by Circumcision. This some deny of all other Persons beside himself. But it is highly incredible; because Ishmael being circumcifed at the Age of Thirteen Years, it is not to be suppos'd that the excellent Father would suffer him all that Time to be educated in Infidelity; nor that those Hundreds of adult Males he maintain'd in his Service, were all Unbelievers at their Circumcision: nor all the Profelytes in future Times to be no better than egregious Hypocrites. Faith in Sincerity many of them had before, and that was fign'd by Circumcifion. And to Infants that Rite fign'd God's faithful Promise of Grace to circumcife the Heart, and work it up into Faith and Obedience, which on his part was very fure; fince in Stipulations and Contracts the Seals annex'd, oblige all Parties to the Performance of the respective Conditions. Abraham is, indeed, the only Person mention'd in Scripture. whose Righteousness of Faith going before, Circumcifion feal'd. And the Reason is, Because he, in a most eminent Degree, was the choice Friend and Favourite of God, the Head of his Family, the visible

visible Church at that Time, the Father of the Faithful in succeeding Generations, and their shining Pattern and Exemplar. Also the History of his pious Life is particularly recorded in Holy Writ for our Benefit, while the Lives of other Believers, that were circumcised with him, are pass'd over in Silence, by reason they were of inferior Note and Quality, except his Steward Eliezer of Damascus: who, if he was the same with that eldest Servant and Steward of his House, Gen. xxiv. 2. (as Menochius and others probably hold) was a very

faithful and religious Person.

3. Some running upon their wild and groundless Notions, affirm, The Patriarchal Covenant, and the Oeconomy of Religion depending on it, which they strongly fancy to be the Legal, was all diffolv'd by Christ at the preaching of the Gospel. Their Design herein is to shew, That we cannot argue from thence for the Admission of Infants into Covenant in the Gospel-Times, since that whole Frame and Scheme is now demolish'd. But this is impossible to be true, because that Covenant and Oeconomy was not Legal, but Evangelical; which Christ came to confirm and complete, not to destroy. Enlargements we find made in it by Christ, actually to take in all Nations, according to the Promise of that Covenant; rather than Retrenchments, to bar out those that were receiv'd in before.

4. The Covenant continuing still in sull Force, the Change of the Seal could make no Alteration in its Terms, Nature and Contents. Christ had good Reason to change the Seal, as is obvious to all that will but consider: But no Reason had he to change the spiritual and everlasting Covenant of his Father, which he came not to cancel, but sulfil. Nor does the bare Change of the Seal, in its own Nature, or by virtue of the Fact, make the least Change in the Covenant itself. For this is common

with

with Men to do, without invalidating the Deeds, or infringing the Rights and Privileges therein contain'd. Sovereign States do change or alter their Seals upon the Union of Kingdoms, Principalities, and the like Emergencies, by Quartering their Arms according to those Accessions: yet if there be Occafion to renew Charters and Patents to their Subjects. the fetting a new Seal to those Deeds alters not their Nature, nor retrenches ought of the old Privileges. The same holds true in Contracts, Covenants and all Obligations between the Subjects. They use what Seals they please, and that makes no Difference so long as the Deeds are valid in themselves, and legally executed. So the Rights remain as they were, notwithstanding the Alteration of the Seals. And why not the same in God's Covenant, tho' Circumcision be chang'd for Baptism?

IV. I come now to shew, How the Right of Infants to be admitted into the Evangelical Church and Covenant by the proper Ordinance, results from the Promises. For the Abrahamical Covenant, which continu'd in Force from the Patriarchs down to Christ, throughout the Judaic Dispensation, being the very fame Evangelical Covenant we have at present, only with an Alteration of the Seal, larger Explications of the Contents, and an Overture of it made to all Nations; it follows, That those Infants of Profes'd Believers, who had, by God's Order, a long and uninterrupted Possession of the Covenant-Rights and Privileges, must have the same still, unless it can be clearly prov'd that God has fince disposses'd them. It was fettled upon them as a fure Entail by a free Grant or Act of Grace, which to this Day, does not appear to be annull'd; and confirm'd they always were in their ancient Claim and Right by the proper Seal and fæderal Ordinance. And, therefore, tho' the Seal be chang'd, yet those Infants having a fœde-

ral Relation unto God their Father, as born of Abrabam's Spiritual Seed, they have, by God's Law and Appointment, the fame original Right to the covenanting Seal, that the Seed of Abraham ever had. Confequently, they ought to be folemnly initiated -into their old Covenant of Grace by Christian Baptifin, which now succeeds Circumcifion for that Purpose. For I take it to be a certain Rule. That the same Covenant will always receive into it the fame Persons, in the same Capacities and Qualifications. And this, as the Lawyers and Civilians speak, being not an Odious, but a Favourable Case. vefting People in fignal Privileges, the largest and most extensive Construction should be put on the Law, or Grant, that the Terms thereof will reasonably bear. Whereas, in Odious or Hard Cases alone. they are for Retrenchments and Limitations.

But before I come close to this Point, I am oblig'd to confider some Difficulties and Obstructions which our Adversaries have cast in our Way. Mr. Tombs, Mr. Keach and Mr. Gale deny Baptism to succeed Circumcifion. The two first will not allow Baptism also to be a covenanting Seal and Ordinance, whatever the last does. Circumcision, as they say, did not fore-run Baptism, but was typical of the inward Circumcifion of the Heart; nor has Baptism the same Use in the Christian Church, that Circumcision had among the Fews. Therefore, can we draw no just Inferences from the one Ordinance to the other, because they are not Parallels; or, if we attempt to, do it, they threaten to run us into Absurdities. And they ground themselves for this on the Scripture's Silence, which no where calls Baptism Circumcision, nor says,

that it succeeds unto it.

Well may we be amaz'd at this Doctrine. For what if we have not express Words in Scripture, so long as Things themselves are there? If Baptism cannot succeed Circumcission, because it does not

1)

bear its Name, it follows as well, that one Sovereign cannot succeed another, unless he be his Name-sake, We allow Baptism to be a different Rite from Circumcision, and if, in some Particulars, it has a different Use, it may still succeed it in other Uses; else, the Christian Priesthood could not succeed the Levitical, nor our Lord's Supper the Fews Passover, nor any Antitype its proper Type and Figure; because they have not the same Names, nor are exactly parallel in all their Uses. Yet between Baptism and Circumcision is there Agreement enough in their main Uses, Purposes, and Significations, to give one a Right to succeed the other, and prove it to be a covenanting Ceremony. For,

1. As Circumcifion formerly initiated the People of God into his Church, so it is acknowledged by our

Adversaries, that Baptism now does. Then,

2. If into the Church of Christ it admits Baptiz'd Persons, and makes them visible Members of his Body, it brings them also visibly within the Covenant of Grace, as Circumcision did, and intitles them to its Privileges. For as this Covenant was given for the Church's Benefit, and not for Insidels; so Church-Members have an apparent, or Presumptive Right unto its Benefits, and none but They. Because the Charter of Grace being issued out to the Citizens of that holy Corporation, to be within the Church, and within the Covenant, are Terms that have a necessary Connexion with one another.

3. The Nature and Design of Baptism bespeak it to be such a stipulating Ceremony, as Circumcision was. For none can enter by Baptism into the Church, without being supposed to undertake the sincere Profession of Christianity, and to stipulate with God to live accordingly. Dedicated he is by that Act to the Service of God, and to Faith in the adorable Trinity. God also must be supposed to accept of the Person, to adopt him for his Child, and to ingage himself to

bestow

bestow upon him the Graces and Blessings of the Covenant, according to the Terms prescribed in the Gospel. And this whole Affair is solemnly transacted between the appointed Minister on God's Part, and the Baptized Party on his own, or by those that have a Right to act and covenant in his Name. So there are both Presentation, and Acceptance, which amount to a mutual Obligation. Not to mention Verbal Stipulations, which are the facred Promises of God's Word, and the folemn Engagements of Baptized Persons. Baptisin must, therefore, have the Use and Nature of a covenanting Ordinance, and serve for that End, as an external Seal: Much alike as it was with Sacrifices in ancient Times. The bare Act of offering them to God, and his Acceptance, ratified the Covenant, and fuffic'd for reciprocal Pledges, without any farther Formalities of Expressions, Psal. 1. 5. Gen. xv. 9, &c.

4. As the Carnal Circumcifion among the Fews fignified the Spiritual, and was an Insurance of Grace for this End; so has Baptism the same Signification among Christians. Our Adversaries are under a gross Mistake, when they affirm the Outward Circumcifion to be typical of the Inward; whereas it was, indeed, symbolical of it. Between both which there is, in Propriety of Speech, great Difference. For the Types of Scripture represented Things that were future, material, and fenfible: But Symbols represented Things that were present, spiritual, or moral. And this Signification the Carnal Circumcifion always had in the Old Testament; as Baptism has in the New. The Scripture Expresfions are fufficiently strong and clear to make it a fæderal Rite, or matriculating Ordinance, that initiates into the Church, and, consequently, into the Covenant, and invests in all the spiritual Privileges of the Gospel. For thus we read of Baptism:

That in it we put on Christ, and are made the Children of God; are incorporated into his Body, the Church; are fantified, cleansed, and justified, by receiving Remission of Sins, which are there wash'd away: are dead and buried unto Sin with Christ, and with him risen again to Newness of Life; are regenerated, or born of Water and the Spirit; are baptized into the Faith and Worship of the holy Trinity, and thereby made Christ's Disciples ; and, finally, by Baptism we are faved. All this is certainly true, when we take the whole Ordinance together in the outward Sign and the inward Grace. For we depend not on the Romanists Opus operatum, nor on the bare internal Incomes of Enthusiasts. God must work his Will for our Salvation in his own Way, and we must not divide and mangle his holy Ordinances in our Accounts. Sincere he always is in his Overtures of Grace to Mankind; and if they be false in their Transactions with him, that evacuates not the Sincerity of his gracious Intentions, nor puts in any just Exception to the Efficacy of his Ordinances. But if, after all, our Antagonists are not satisfied

by what is here advanced, I hope they will frand to their own Doctrine; which they have openly published in these Words: "Sacraments ordained of "Christ, be not only Badges, or Tokens of Christian Mens Profession; but rather they be certain fure Witnesses, and effectual Signs of Grace, and God's good Will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him." Article of the Christian Faith XXV. Are

they not then Affurances of Grace on God's Part, as well as Badges and Tokens of Profession on Mens Part? And what Sense, or Construction, will this

Language bear, but that they are mutual Engagements and Stipulations between God and Men in the Way of Covenant?

Where-

Wherefore, fince there is so much Agreement between the two Ordinances, in their Uses and Designs, we conclude, That Baptism is come in the room of Circumcision, and is succedaneous to it, as

a covenanting Ceremony.

Some of our Adversaries take much Pains to shew the Differences between the two Ordinances. And who denies that Point? Otherwise, if they did not differ at all, they must be the same. And to what Purpose? For, cannot Two Ordinances correspond in any thing, because they do not correspond in all Things? Or, may not one succeed the other in its principal Uses, because in some Uses and Respects of lesser Note, they disagree? Then could not Christ's Priesthood succeed Aaron's, nor his Sacrifice the Levitical, nor his Church and Service the Judaical, nor any Antitype its Type and Shadow, because in some, or in several Respects, they differ from one another, as was observed before.

Again, "Baptism could not succeed Circumcision, " because they co-existed for some Time; People be-"ing circumcifed according to the Law, and also Baptiz'd by John and Christ." How then could King William III: Succeed Queen Mary in the whole Government, feeing that for some Years they reign'd toge-ther. History gives us Instances of Bishops sitting together in the same Sees, and of Emperors on the same Thrones, for a Time, 'till at last, some leaving the World, left their Partners that furviv'd, to fucceed them in their whole Power and Offices. This Argument, therefore, proves weak in Civil Polity; nor is it stronger in Divinity: For, Christ's Priesthood and Sacrifice fucceeded the Aaronical; yet they both co-existed for some Time. For, after Christ's Crucifixion, when his Sacrifice was offer'd, and his Priesthood commenc'd, we find the Apostles convented before the High-Priefts of the Jews, and answering for themselves without denying or impeaching

their Authority; and St. Paul in Tract of some Years following, befpeaking Reverence to one of them on the account of his Function, Ads xxiii. 5. So did the Christian Church and Service suceeed that of the Temple. Yet did the Apostles and Disciples, after the Christian Church and Service were founded, continue daily to frequent the Temple-Worship; to observe the Jews Hours of Prayer, and their Feast of Pentecost: to undertake their Religious Vows, shave their Heads, make their Oblations, and submit to other Legal Ceremonies, when they faw convenient. I think, it was the Destruction of the Temple, and the whole Fewish Polity, that put a full End to the Legal Oeconomy, which 'till then was tolerated, or counted lawful. Upon that the Christian Religion took place alone, and was, in Point of Right, without a Rival. Circumcifion, indeed, was stubborn and restive enough to quit its Place; but at length it yielded among Christians, and gave way to Baptilm.

But what Nonfense and Falshood is this which follows! "The Antitype which came in the Room of " the Circumcifion of the Flesh, is the Circumcision of the Heart." Did it come in its Room? Then, according to their own Doctrine, it could have no Room 'till the Carnal Circumcifion was quite remov'd. And poor carnal Jews indeed were they, who knew nothing of the Circumcifion of the Heart; the Patriarchs, Moses and the Prophets, who inculcated fome fuch thing in Words, not excepted! But the Spiritual Circumcifion is no more an Antitype to the Carnal, than Regeneration is an Antitype unto Baptisin. For neither of the Two Ordinances are to be counted Typical of the inward Circumcision, but Symbolical. And, if my Judgment fails me not, between Types and their Antitypes, there must be some external Refemblance, of which the inward Operations of the Heart are not capable. But certain it

is, that the Grace or Vertue signified by the Circumcision of the Heart, was not only requir'd from the first Institution of the Carnal, but from the Creation of the World, in all People that would please God. And if true it was, as it is undoubtedly false, that the inward Circumcision is the Antitype to the outward, then could a Type and its Antitype substiff together, not only from John's Baptism to our Saviour's Passion, but from Abraham's Days down to Christ's.

There is a Place we make Use of, Col. ii. 11, 12. which Mr. Tombs, Mr. Gale and others, have vex'd and tortur'd with all their Power. The Words are these: In whom also ye are circumcifed with the Circumcision made without Hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ; Buried, or being Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him thro' the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raised him from the Dead. The Apostle says, That this was done in the Ordinance of Baptism. All, therefore, that I request of those Gentlemen, is, that they will grant me Baptisin to be Symbolical of the Circumcision of the Heart, as the Carnal Circumcifion was. And if this they will not grant, I can command it from them in spite of their Hearts. For what is meant by those Meta. phorical Expressions, Being buried and raised with Christ in Baptism, but Sanctification of the Heart and Life, which we call Regeneration, Circumcision of the Heart, or a Dying to Sin, and a Rising again to a New-ness of Life? And does not the outward Ordinance of Baptism represent and signify this, according to the Antipadobaptists own Doctrine set down before concerning the Sacraments? Symbolical, therefore, it is of the Circumcision made without Hands, as the Carnal Circumcifion was before; and, confequently it succeeds it in that Use and spiritual Signification; which is all that I contend for. And there I shall rest, rill

cill I find it deny'd and disprov'd. For Mr. Gale's Discourse does not affect my Sense of it in the least, nor his Arguments conclude against me.

And fo I return to speak directly to the Business in hand, and infer Infant-Baptism from the former

Grounds and Observations.

1. When God made the Covenant of Grace with Abraham, he did, in Essentials, give us the Plan and Platform of the Evangelical Church, as he defign'd it should continue in all Ages, the Temporal Bleffings excepted relating to the Land of Canaan. But the Spiritual Privileges were to run down to the Church in an uninterrupted Course from thence to our Saviour's Days, and to the Consummation of the World. For as the Covenant was everlafting, fo the Church founded upon it, should be also everlasting, when confider'd in its Militant and Triumphant State. The Christian Church is but the Abrahamical Church con inu'd and inlarg'd. In that Model God compriz'd the Spiritual Bleffings given by Promife to his peculiar People, forerold their future Communication to all Nations, appointed the Covenanting Seal and Incorporating Ordinance that should be us'd'till Christ came, and specify'd what Persons should be receiv'd into the Church and Covenant. These were not only the Adult, but also the Infants of all profesfed Believers; the Males by Circumcifion, and the Females by a pure Act of Grace without the Seal, of which they were not capable. In the Males, they might be reckon'd as circumcis'd, while that Act was imputed to them, that they might avoid the great Reproach of Uncircumcifion. For, to Abraham's Descendents, Male and Female, and to his Spiritual Seed the Profelytes, and to their Seed's Seed throughout all Generations, did the Covenant extend; Gen. xvii. 7. At the Head of whom should be that eminent Seed Christ Jesus, and under him all profe's'd Believers, with their If fue.

fue. And when the Redeemer should come out of Sion, this also is the Tenor of the Covenant; My Spirit that is upon thee, and my Words which I have put in thy Mouth, shall not depart out of thy Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed's Seed, saith the Lord, from hence-

forth and for ever, Isa. lix. 20, 21.

The Patriarchal Church was the first Model of a visible organized Church we find describ'd and characteriz'd in the Scripture; and it being the Foundation, Scheme, or Rough-draught of the Evangelical Church, as now perfected, it must continue, in the main, to be the Model of Christianity. What God then contrived and promised, he would fulfil, and the perfect Accomplishment was to be in Christ. For Christ came to perform the Mercy promised to our. Fathers, and to remember his holy Covenant; the Oath which he sware to our Father Abraham, Luke i. A Branch of which Covenant it was, That the Gentiles should be Fellow Heirs with the old Israelites, and of the same Body, and Partakers of the Spiritual Promises, Eph. iii. 6, 9, 11. But how are they Fellow-Heirs? How are they incorporated into the fame Body, and made Partakers of the Promifes, if only actual Believers among them shall enjoy the covenanted Privileges, and not their Seed, as the Promises contained, and as the ancient Israelites did? This is to be but half Heirs, and half Partakers. and Members of the Body in an incompleted Degree, fince their Seed, as fuch, are cut off from the ancient Claims and covenanted Rights. If it was then an Inheritance intail'd to Parents and Children together, it must be so now; or else the Intail is dock'd, the Inheritance maim'd and leffen'd, the Covenant impair'd, the Promises are clipp'd, and the Privileges diminish'd. Surely, Christ did not thus fulfil the Promises by halves, but the Gentiles must come in on the same Foot and Level with the

old Ifraelites, as the Profelytes always did in Spirituals.

Moses was faithful as a Servant in the House of God, and Christ was faithful as a Son in his own House, Heb. iii. 2, 5, 6. Moses, therefore, to express his Fidelity, did all Things after the Pattern shewed him on the Mount, in building the Tabernacle, and modelling the Church under the legal Covenant. And, without doubt, Christ express'd his Fidelity in modelling the Christian Church according to the Evangelical Pattern given to our Father Abraham, without any Alterations but what were necessary and foretold, and what he himself inform'd us of. No Man was so well acquainted with his heavenly Father's Will; and if it had been his Father's Will, to cast the Infants of believing Parents out of Covenant and Chuch-Communion, or debar them of Entrance thither, after the Days of Christ, when he threw the Doors of Grace wide open to those that were not in before, I am persuaded. Christ had been kind and faithful to tell us of it in plain Words, and not put People to the Shifts of deducing it by strained Consequences. For it was a material Point, which abridg'd many Millions of Infants of plain, great, and long-enjoy'd Privileges relating to Religion. Things which pious and affectionate Parents, especially Fews with whom Christ convers'd, are apt to be very tender and tenacious of, in behalf of their beloved Children. I think, this was Part of his Prophetical Office to instruct us in; and a Word or two would have suffic'd. As I have observ'd before, of Improvements, or Inlargements made for the Benefit of Heathen Nations, conformably to the general Promise of the Covenant, we read in our Saviour's Gospel; but of Retrenchments made to the Prejudice of Infants, contrary to the old Promife, we there read not one Syllable, tho' some fancy that they do. It

Circum-

It remains therefore, that the Clogs and Clouds of the legal Covenant being clean removed, we are now return'd to the pure, primitive, Evangelical Church-Constitution, laid on the Plan of the Abrahamical Covenant; and, we hope, our Infants may be permitted to enjoy their ancient Privileges, wherein God has invested them from the Beginning, to be held intirely to the End, by virtue of his gracious Charter. And so we are bold to enter them into that Church and Covenant by his appointed Ordinance, agreeably to the Right he hath sounded for them, and to the Rule and Pattern he hath prescrib'd to us. For we know not a wifer, better, and more authentic Precedent that we can follow.

2. To support this Observation, let it be farther confider'd, what was the Law of Profelytisin among the Hebrews. For we being Converts at first from the Gentiles, as Proselytes were of old, do ground our Claims to Church-Privileges on the same Bottom that they did. In fuch Conversions, the First-fruits they were to God, and we are as the Harvest. Abraham's Seed they became thereby, and so are we become. Embodied they were with God's Church, and Joint-Partakers in its Privileges with the Native Hebrews, and the same it is with us. when they were admitted into the Church and Covenant by Circumcifion, all their Infants were admitted together with the Parents, and the Males in like manner were circumcifed. And thenceforth, in their Posterity, they enjoy'd the same spiritual Rights with the People of God that were Fews by Birth. For there was one Law to the Home-born, and the converted Strangers. And this ought to be our Pattern for initiating Infants into the Church and Covenant, fince we are introduced and fettled upon the same Foundation with the Proselytes, and like them become Abraham's Children and the true Israelites in the Spirit. For we are the spiritual

Circumcifion, Phil. iii. 13. the Children of Abraham. and bleffed with him, Gal. iii. 17, 9. 10 And being Christ's, we are Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise, v. 29. as Zaccheus the Publican and, probably, a Gentile by Birth, was the Son of Abrabam, Luke xix. 9. And so we are now the Israel of God, Gal. vi. 16. For upon their Stock we frand, and are incovenanted into their Rights. Many or most of them being cut off for Unbelief; we are grafted into their Stem, and partake in the Room and Painess of their Olive-Tree, Rom. xi. 17. which was their Church, Jer. xi. 16. If therefore, we perfectly fucceed them in their primitive Spiritual Rights, the same Claim that they had for their Children to be incovenanted on the old Foundation. frands fast for the Infants of Christian Parents: Otherwise, we succeed them only in part, and enjoy but a Moiety of their Religious Privileges under the full Display of the Covenant of Grace, and its utmost Completion in Christ Jesus. And the Olive-Tree also, which was fat and fruitful to their, is become lean and barren to our Children; who, during their Infancy, Suffer the Effects of its Leannels, but are absolutely deprived of its Fatness. For no Communication have they with it; and no Nourishment does it give them. Then are we not treated as the spiritual Ifrael always were, but as un converted Gentiles are, whose Children come into Covenant and Church-Communion as foon as they give Evidence of actual Faith, and ours, it feems, must come in no sooner; which is no better than to un-church and un-covenant us in our Children.

Pretended it is, That Faith alone makes us the Children of Abraham, and the spiritual Ifrael; which Infants wanting, they cannot be Abraham's Children, nor that Ifrael. But such Qualifications as Faith and Repentance, are requisite only in Perfons arrived to the Use of Resson, who stand ingaged

to Personal Duties and Services in the Church, as they ever stood in all Occonomies of Religion; whereas Infants were allow'd to enjoy Privileges according to their Capacities, but never tied to Perfonal Performances in Matters of Duty. When David describes a Citizen of Zion, or a Member of the Church of God, by these Characters; That be walketh uprightly, worketh Righteousness, speaketh the Truth from his Heart, &c. Ps. xv. 2, &c., it would be a wrong Inference made from thence. That no Infants could be Citizens of Zion, or were Members of God's Church at that Time, because they could have none of those Qualifications. No less inconclusive is it to infer. That Infants cannot now be Abraham's Children, nor Members of Christ's Church, because they want the Faith and other Properties required in adult Persons, to make 'em really so. Yet is this a Vein of Weakness and Error that runs thro' the Discourses of the Antipadobaptists; and many of Mr. Gale's Observations from the Fathers, against Infant Baptism, have no other Bottom.

But 'tis farther objected, "May we not as well pretend a Title to the Land of Canaan, on the aforesaid Account, as to the Privileges of the Old " Israel, and particularly to the covenanting Or-" dinance for little Children?" No, we may not; because there is too much Difference in the Cases, for us to found such a foolish Claim or Title, as is there fuggefted. For one was a Temporal Blefling. and the other is Spiritual. The earthly Canaan was no Privilege of the Patriarchal Church, in which the Fathers had not a Foot of Inheritance, except only to bury their Dead. The Promise of it was never made to proselyted Gentiles, but to the Nation of the Tews alone; and it was typical of another Canaan, into which we shall not enter 'till we die. That Spot of Ground could never contain all the

the Christians in the World; nor are we such Fools as to be fond of Types, when we have the Anti-types, and to dwell in the Clouds, when we have a clear Heaven over our Heads. Frivolous, indeed, are such Objections; yet are we concern'd to take some Notice of 'em, that they who make 'em, may not seem wise in their own Conceit, nor therewith

abuse the Injudicious.

3. If our Warrant and Commission for admitting Infants into the Evangelical Church and Covenant by the proper Ceremony, be required, we can produce one from God's own Mouth, of as old a Date as the Days of Abraham. For God commanded Abraham, and all Posterity that were of his Faith, so to initiate their little Children. And his Order for it has never fince been countermanded. He only substituted another initiating Ordinance in the former's room, but gave no Directions to exclude Infants.

4. The Command for that Purpose was very peremptory, and back'd with the Penalty of Excision, upon Contempt. The Infants themselves could not be guilty of any culpable Omission, it being no Fault of their Will, if they were not initiated after God's Law, which they could neither desire, or re-fuse. Yet, upon Neglect of sulfilling the Law, those Infants should be cut off from God's People, as Violators of his Covenant, Gen. xvii. 14. Hard Usage this may seem to Men who give themselves fuch a Liberty of Thought, that they cannot per-ceive how the Condition of Infants is better or worse for Things that are not within their Power. Circumcifed or Uncircumcifed, Baptized or Unbaptized, are equally indifferent, in their Opinion, because nothing is lost or gain'd by either, unto Infants. Only to baptize them is a flagrant Sin in Christ's Ministers; but that it can any-ways better their spiritual State, is positively denied by Antipadobaptifts

padobaptifts on their faithful Word, which we must not question. For dare we affirm, that Baptism takes off Original Sin, when we fee that Bantized Persons can be Sinners? We dare, and do it boldly. in respect of the Stain it transmits unto the Soul and the Guilt, or Obligation, to eternal Punishment. For we firmly adhere to that famous Declaration of our Church in behalf of baptized Infants; "It is " certain, from God's Word, that Children which are " Baptized, dying before they commit actual Sin-" are undoubtedly saved. And of the same Per-" fuasion was the 5th Council of Carthage, wherein " St. Austin presided; Quicung; negat parvulos, &c. "Whosoever denies Infants to be deliver'd from " Perdition by Christian Baptism, and to ob-" tain eternal Salvation, let him be Anathema." Then must the Guilt and Pollution of Original Sin in Infants be removed by that Ordinance. Also Grace is there ensur'd to them, to break the Force and reigning Power of Sin, when they grow up, and it will prove an effectual Remedy, if in following Times it be complied with and duly cultivated. But if it be hard for others to believe, that Circumcifion could, or Baptisin can, amend the spiritual State of Infants; it is harder yet for us to believe, that God, in establishing the Covenant of Grace. would exercise an arbitrary Power to injoin on Infants, under a severe Sanction, a painful Rite to be kept precisely on a certain Day, which in the Accounts of Religion was good for nothing. How ferviceable the Life of Moses was to the Church of God, is well known; yet was that Life indanger'd to be cut off fhort before the Services were done, for neglecting to circumcife his Son at the Time prescribed, Exod. iv. 24. Which, I think, should caution Christian Parents against being careless and dilatory in baptizing their Children, and entring them betimes into the Church and Covenant. " But

"But why then do we not bind ourselves to ban-"tize em punctually on the Eighth Day after their "Birth, as the Command strictly ran for their " Circumcifion?" I answer, 'Tis because we do not hold an exact Parallel in all Particulars between the Two Ordinances, as Mr. Gale and others, who infift on this Objection, suppose we do. What we urge, belongs to the substantial Parts of the Ordinances, not to the circumstantial; and in these, the Ordinances of the New Testament do vary from the Old ones. Now Time is but a Circumstance, which is more changeable and dispensable than the Sacrament it self. Neither has Christ given such punchual Prescriptions about the Administration of Baptism, in respect of Circumstances, as God had given about Circumcision. For in such Matters the Gospel is a Law of Liberty, and leaves us to the Latitude of Discretion. And for this Liberty there is apparent Reason; because an Universal Church foread over the whole World, cannot be tied to fuch Niceties and Punctilio's, as a Patriarchal or National Church was. What fuits the one, will not fuit the Condition of the other Oeconomy. And especially, in the present Case, there is this Difference: Circumcifion being limitted to a certain Day, to fulfil the Law, it was allow'd other Persons to circumcife, beside the Priests and Levites, when these were not at hand; or beside the Fathers, when they neglected it. Then, as P. Tragius says on Deut. x. 16. " A Servant, tho' uncircumcifed himfelf, and " even a Woman, or a Youth, that was not an Eth-" nick or Infidel, might circumcife." And Grotius, on Gen. xvii. 12. fays, "It might be done by "Women and private Men, provided they were " not fuch as he calls Ex-leges. So Zipporah cir-" cumcifed Gershom, Exod. iv. 25." For the Truth of this, because I find it question'd, my Authors stand accountable. But the Administration of Baptism being confin'd to Men in Holy Orders, many times such Ministers could not be had, in Case it was limitted to a precise Day. And several other Inconveniencies might render the Matter extremely hard, if not impracticable. Necessity, therefore, will dispense with that Circumstance. Let it be also observed, that Baptism invests in Privileges that are highly valuable; whereas the prescribing of a set Day, would impose a Hardship that is now unsupportable, as Matters stand. These Privileges Infants enjoy'd long before, the they were not tied to the same Duties with adult Persons. And it is not reasonable they should, under the same Covenant, be thrown out of their old Privileges, for the sake of Hardships to which they themselves in Equity were never oblig'd, and which others

cannot perform in their Behalf.

5. Admittance into God's Church and gracious Covenant being a high Privilege, that intitles to many Divine Favours; those Infants, who by God's folemn Act of Grace had the Right of Prescription to that Privilege from Abraham's Days down to Christ, must be continued in it to the World's End, unless it plainly appears, that God has since divested them of their Right. Possession of the Seal and initiatory Ceremony they had by God's Law, and by immemorial Custom, which in a Matter of Grace or Benefit firmly pleads their Right still, and establishes their Claim. Nor can any new Demerits be alledg'd against them, as a Bar to their ancient Rights. The Law for their Investiture was clear and firong, and so ought to be the Law for their Disseisure too, in Case it had ever passed. For the Repeal of Laws, by Implication and farfetched Consequences, is not allow'd; but the Repeal must be plain and positive, as the enacting of the Law was, that it may appear to be the Will and Intent of the Legislator. Where God was pleafed

sed to communicate his Favours, Men must not venture to make Inclosures or Restrictions; and, in Matters of that Nature, even a probable Right and Claim, that injures not another Party, ought in Equity to take place. No need was there of a new Precept to injoin the Duty, or confirm the Right, when the original Law, under the same Evangelical Dispensation, and for the same covenanted Privileges, remained in Force, and the Practice of the Church had run on that Side in a long uninterrupted Channel. But if, in after-Times. God was determin'd to retrench Infants of their ancient Privileges, there was Need he should fignify his Mind in Words that were neither dark nor ambiguous; fince the Revocation of a Grant or Charter should be as evident as the Deed of Gift. and not depend on such firain'd Deductions as are foreign to the Case of Infants; and, therefore, in themselves, most unreasonable. So the old Grant, Law and Custom, do, to this Day, stand invio-Table.

6. That God's Love-to the Infants and little Children of believing Parents, is in the least abated upon our Saviour's coming into the World, we have no Reason to imagine; but are very certain, it still continues as it did before. Why then should we think he has dif-privileg'd them, or cast them clean out of his Church and Covenant ? As to what regards his Affection towards them, the Style of the New Testament runs as much in their Favour, as it did in the Old; and so do the Actions of our Saviour. Thus the Evangelical Promises in their Behalf formerly went; I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee, in all Generations, for an everlafting Covenant, to be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee, Gen. xvii. 7. Hereby God oblig'd himself for ever to be a Benefactor to Abraham and his Posterity, in spiritual Blef-

the

fings, and fign'd it to Infants of Eight Days old. that were his natural, or spiritual Seed, by a visible Seal. And why should he refuse to sign it still, under the same gracious Covenant, forasmuch as the Covenant it felf, and his good Will therein confirmed, were to be everlasting? So when he reestablished the same Covenant with the Fews in Moab, he took in the Little Ones with their Parents, and also those that were unborn at that Time, Deut. xxix. 11, 12, 15. And this was to last as a Law under the Christian Oeconomy in our Saviour's Days. For St. Paul fays, that the Word of Faith which he and the other Apostles preached, was contain'd in that Covenant. Likewise, Isa. lix. 21. when the Redeemer should come to Zion, the same Covenant was to continue to Christians and their Seed, and to their Seed's Seed for ever. And feeing these were the old Grants and Promises of God to the holy Seed, and to remain stedfast thro' all Generations, in vain shall we look to find them abolish'd by Jesus Christ, who came not to annul, but to fulfil the Promises of the Covenant. For, after the old Style, the Children of Christians are still holy, 1 Cor. vii. 14. and Rom. xi. 16. because they are born of holy Parents, who are Children of the Covenant, and Heirs of the Promises made to the Fathers, Acts iii. 25. and Ch. ii. 39.

Wherefore, towards the Infants and little Children of such Parents as were in Covenant Relation with God, we know what Kindness and tender Affection his beloved Son expressed. Patterns of Conversion, and Emblems of Humility, he makes them to his Disciples, Matt. xviii. 3. And a little lower, v. 5, 6. he declares; Whoso shall receive one such little Child in my Name, receiveth me. But whoso shall offend any one of these Little Ones, which believe in me, it were better for him that a Milstone were hanged about his Neck, and that he were drowned in

E 2

the Depth of the Sea. Also, when Infants were brought to Christ, that he should lay his Hands on them and pray, and his Disciples rebuked those that brought them, he was much displeased with their mif-guided Zeal; but he called the Infants to him, gave a general Command, that they should be fuffer'd to come unto him, took them up in his Arms, gave them his Bleffing, and pronounced, That of such as them was the Kingdom of God. These Passages shew, that God's Love to the Infants and Children of believing Parents, is not at all abated upon Christ's coming to preach the Gospel; but that he retains the same gracious Inclination to them, that he had when he preached the Gospel unto Abraham: And, consequently, it cannot be supposed, that he has thrown them out of Covenant, or rejected them from Fellowship and Communion with his Church. His Pattern of Love should be follow'd, and the former Measures should not be chang'd; but to God and Christ we may boldly bring our Infants for Gospel Grace and Bleffing, and dedicate them to God by the proper Ordinance, fince we know his Willingness to receive them. We innovate nothing herein, but observe the old Rule and Method. Nor do we presume without Grounds; because the Words and Actions of his own Son promise in their Favour all the Assurance we can desire of a kind Reception.

7. They who exclude such Infants from the Covenant of Grace, and the Society of the Faithful, do their Parts effectually to disannul the Covenant to those Infants. For they rescind God's sacred and solemn Act of Grace passed to the Off-spring of faithful Parents, as an everlasting Covenant to all Generations. And if for this they have not a sufficient Warrant from God himself, let them consider how they will answer it at his Tribunal. Rigor and Severity, in such Cases, may be of dange-

rous Consequence, and highly offensive to the Divine Majesty; whereas to chuse the favourable Side, in Case we really err'd, gives us a just Presumption of Pardon, because Mercy rejoiceth against Judgment. St. Paul speaking of the Covenant of Grace made with Abraham, uses Words that deserve our Adversaries serious Reflections, Gal. iii. 15. Brethren, I speak after the manner of Men: Tho' it be a Man's Covenant, yet, if it be confirmed, no Man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. It human Wills and Covenants be thus inviolable, the Will and Covenant of God is more inviolable, and must not be annull'd by Men. To the Infants of professed Believers was his Covenant made, and to endure for ever: Yet, to them is it denied by Antipadobaptists, who refuse to Infants the Agnition and Confirmation of the Covenant.

But against this they may suggest; "We med-" dle not with the Will and Covenant of God, but " grant and affirm too, that God freely remits to "Infants Original Sin, and receives them into "Heaven without the Sacrament of Baptism." Wherefore, by allowing them the main Benefits

" of the Covenant, we rather confirm, than disan-

nul the Covenant.

In return to which, I answer, That our Adversaries are liberal in granting to Infants what is clean out of their Power to give or refuse: And, what is worse for them, they give them what they can never prove to be their Right and Due from God's Word, when in an unbaptized State they allot unto them Remission of Sin and eternal Salvation. In the mean while, they are wonderful sparing of what is in their Power to give and grant; namely, Admission into the Church and Covenant by Christian Baptism. What need we thank them for not cramping the merciful Hands of God, as they do their own; and for not absolutely shutting the E 3 Gates Gates of Heaven against Infants, as they shut against them the Doors of the Church? And, yet, virtually, and by good Consequence, they do the

former also.

But, to justify my present Charge; They really difannul the Covenant to Infants, who deny them the sealing Ordinance. Had it pleased God in our Days to leave the Covenant without a visible Seal, we must have referr'd all to his good Pleasure, and been content. But now, as he order'd the Matter otherwise from Abraham's Time, so we must leave it to stand in the same Posture and Situation that he has plac'd it: Else it is certain, that when by Law, or Compact, a Seal is made necessary to a Covenant, he that refuses to seal, does, by Construction of Law, refuse the Covenant. For so the Male-Infant was accounted to break the Covenant, and be effectually out of it, who was not circumcifed at the Day appointed. When Parents contract for their Children, and Guardians for their Wards, tho' they bring all to a full Agreement, yet, if they refuse to affix the Seal, or perform the necessary Rite of Confirmation, they disannul the Contract, and deny their Children, or Wards, all its Benefits. In like manner, they who reject Infants from the Covenanting Ordinance, and deny them the initiating Ceremony into God's Church, do their Part to deny them the Bleffings of the Covenant, and all the Benefits of Church-Communion. "For the break-" ing off of the Seal (and it is the same to refuse it) " cancels the Covenant to which it was prefix'd, " as all Men know, fays Mr. Benj. Keach, Bel. Bapt. " display'd, Chap. I. p. 1." And is not this effe-Etually to disannul the Covenant to those Children. who were certainly in it once, 'till they arrive to Years of Discretion, and to set them to stand on the same Level with the Children of Infidels? How numerous those Children are in the Christian World,

we leave to conjecture; a nice and exact Computation being as needless as it is impossible. Too many by far they certainly are to be wrong'd in the

least of their spiritual Interests.

8. What soever Persons are out of the Covenant of Grace, they are left to the Law of Nature, or to the first Covenant of Works, which requires a perfect and finless Obedience, in order to Justification; by virtue whereof, in our lapsed State, Salvation does therefore become impossible. For there being but Two Covenants in all, that propose Life to Mankind, he that is not within the one, must needs remain under the other. Wherefore, if the Infants of Christian Parents be not within the Covenant of Grace, they are still under the Covenant of Works; and if they be not grafted anew into the Second Adam, who faves all that will be faved, they abide in the Stock of the First Adam, who destroyed them all by Sin, and, as it were, tainted their Blood by Treason and Rebellion against God's Majesty. Shall we then, while they remain in that State and Covenant, hope for their Salvation, which is only to be had on God's Terms, and not on our own? If we do, we hope without a Promise, and presume of Grace and Salvation in their behalf, when God is not oblig'd by Covenant to bestow them. Nay, we hope against the express Declarations of his Word; wherein he affirms, That by the Law and Covenant of Works, no Flesh alive shall be justified. And what a deplorable Foundation is this, to ground the Happiness of our Children upon?

But if within the Covenant of Grace they be, as undoubtedly they are, if they be in a State of Salvation, then let them not be denied God's Seal to confirm and infure his gracious Promifes. Let them not be kept out of his Church, like an unclean and prophane Seed, that still lie under the Covenant of Works, and the Guilt of the first Transgression,

E 4

and therefore are obnoxious to everlasting Death. Thro' Christ only they can be saved, and if His they be by Act of Redemption, give and consecrate them to him by the Sacrament of Baptism, who will never resule his own, nor reject the Purchase of his Blood. For they that are within the Covenant, have, by God's original Order and Charter-Grant, a rightful Claim to its proper Seal. If to the Inheritance of Eternal Life, they have a Right by their Saviour's Death, deny them not the external Evidence and Security. And if Citizens of that glorious Corporation, the Holy Zion and New Jerusalem, they are by Grace, let them enjoy the Privileges that belong to Citizens, and are suitable to their Capacities; for they cannot be with-held without Injustice.

He that has a present Right to an Estate, has the same Right to the Writings and Conveyances. Indeed, if the Inheritance is not in Possession, but Reversion, or if the Heir is by Law or Nature uncapable of Possession, the Securities may remain in other Mens Custody. But, if Infants descending from profess'd Believers are really and actually in a saveable State, they have as much the Right of present Possession, as adult Persons; and are in as good a Capacity of receiving the Deeds and Security

rities, as they were in the Patriarchs Days.

Little to be regarded are our Antagonists, when they dictate dogmatically and magisterially, upon their Word, "That if those Infants be within the "Covenant of Grace, they shall be certainly saved without Baptism, which signifies nothing to bet ter their Condition." This is to cheat us out of our Christian Privileges and Securities; and might as well be said of Circumcisson, as it is of Baptism. But we have not so learned Christ, as to contemn his Sacraments, and neglect our external Evidences for Salvation. A Man may be born

with a Title to an Estate, to Freedom, or other Privileges, and yet be oblig'd to solemn Investiture or Admittance by the appointed Ceremonies, before he can be settled in the actual Enjoyment and Pos-

fession of his Rights.

9. Of the unbelieving Fews the Apostle favs, Rom. 11. 28, 29. As concerning the Gospel they are Enemies for your fake: but as touching the Election, they are beloved for the Fathers fakes. For the Gifts and Calling of God are without Repentance. This he speaks of Men that had treated the Son of God and his Holy Gospel with the highest Indignities. Still God had some Kindness in Reserve for them, for their Fathers fakes: Nor could he finally repent of his gracious Acts in their Behalf; but intended, on those Accounts, some Time after, to re-induce them by Conversion into his Church, v. 26. If such Reasons as these can be pleaded in Favour of stubborn Insidels, with greater Strength may they be alledg'd for Infants. For they are equally upon their Side, supposing the Cases of both were equal. But in this Infants have a manifest Advantage, because they are guilty of no fresh or personal Offences against God, as those Fews were: And without Provocations given, the unchangeable God never alters his gracious Measures towards his People, so as to express Severity where he used to shew Kindness. If therefore, for their Fathers fakes, and for the Sake of his own Gifts and Calling, he intended to re-induce those undeserving Jews into the Church; much more, for the same Reasons, would he retain Infants within the Church, that never offended him, fince by Grace he first brought them in. In a spiritual Account, the Fathers were theirs, and the Gifts and Calling of God were theirs; and we believe they are without Repentance.

Thus far, I conceive, the Scales are even, and the Parallel runs equally on to maintain our Argument. For the State and Condition of Infants is the same now, as it was in Abraham's and the Patriarchs Days; as the Church and Covenant are the same in Substance. Consequently, we are persuaded, they have the same Right to Baptism, that such Infants then had to Circumcision. And if it could be proved, that God hath not commanded them to be baptized; yet can it never be proved, that he hath commanded them to be dis-privileged. I mean, to be cast or

left out of the Church and Covenant,

If, therefore, any Alteration be made in God's Will and Conduct towards Infants, relating to the Point in Agitation, it could be owing to no other Cause, but the dignified Nature of Baptisin, and the Deference due unto it upon that Account above Circumcision. And supposing this were true, yet whether it be a sufficient Ground for such a disadvantageous Change to all the Insants of the Christian World, we dare appeal to impartial Judgment. For to Insants, Baptism may be administred with no less Conveniency than Circumcisson: Of its blessed Privileges they may equally partake. To its Duties and Conditions they may as well be bound. And in the Observance of them they may be educated just as they were in ancient Times.

But that there is any material Difference in refpect of Dignity between Baptism and Circumcifion, I cannot readily yield, when the Nature, Ends and Uses of both are well examined and adjusted. The Act of washing the Body with Water is not in itself more noble, the less painful, than the Rite of Circumcision. If Baptism initiates into the Church of God, and signs the Covenant of Grace, so did Circumcission. If Baptism dedicates to the Worship of God, so did Circumcisson. If Baptism adopts to be his Sons, so did Circumcisson. For

Ifrael

Ifrael is my Son, even my First-born, said God, Exod. iv. 22. when Ifrael knew no other Covenant but that which was seal'd by Circumcision. If Baptism configns to Faith in Christ as come, Circumcision did the same to Christ as suture. If Baptism be the Laver of Regeneration, representing our Death and Burial with Christ to Sin, and our Resurrection with him also to Newness of Life; and if it stipulates for Grace to perform the same, so, in Effect. did Circumcifion. For it fignified and obliged to the inward Circumcision of the Heart and Spirit. and so to a Holy Life, which is equivalent to those Christian Dúties: And God promised Grace for that Purpose to circumcifed Persons, as has been proved before. The Expressions differ, but the Sense agrees. Wherefore, seeing Baptism and Circumcision have much the same Dignity and Uses in the fame Evangelical Church and Covenant, I know no Reason resulting from the Nature of Things, why Baptisin may not as well be administred to Infants. as Circumcifion was; nor why the doing of it should be counted a Prostitution, or Profanation of one Ordinance more than of the other.

Here it will be proper to obviate the main Objections raised by our Adversaries against our Doctrine, that are hitherto unanswered.

I. We are sure to be told, "That Females were" not circumcised under the Old Testament." We freely grant it. But to what Purpose is this alledged? or, How does it make against the Lawfulness of Insant-Baptism? If it be produc'd only to shew, that neither Circumcission, nor Baptism, is absolutely necessary to Salvation, which is the most it can prove; we acknowledge, that Positive Ordinances are necessary for no Persons at all, beside those for whom they are instituted and designed. But if this

this Allegation proves any thing, it proves that Baptism'is no more necessary for adult Persons. than for Infants because Females were not circumcifed in their riper Years, any more than in their Infancy and Minority. Also our Adversaries ought to know, that many Things in Religion may be lawful and rightful, which nevertheless are not of indispensible Necessity. But if from thence they would infer, That Infant-Baptism is not lawful; this Inference hangs by Geometry, there being no manner of Connexion between the Premise and the Conclusion. For how does it follow. Women of old were not circumcifed; therefore, Infants now must not be baptized? It was not the Unlawfulness of the Act that debarred Females from Circumcision, but their natural Incapacity for the Operation: Which Incapacity cannot be pleaded against the baptizing either of them, or Infants. Therefore, the Bar and only Reason that hindred, being

removed, the Practice may follow.

But, if they will affirm, That it was unlawful to circumcife Females, as I know some of them roundly do, I desire to know, by what Rule, or Divine Law, that was in Force at the Institution, and some Centuries after, as the present Measure and Standard of Practice to the Church, they will have this Question decided, or undertake to justify that pretended Unlawfulness? For we will not be determined by any subsequent Laws, that were peculiar to another Dispensation. But if they say, it was always against the Moral and Natural Law, that Men should use any positive Acts or Ordinances in Religion, which God had not commanded; then I require them to shew me a Divine Command for Abel's and Noah's Sacrifices; for Abraham's giving Tythes to Melchisedec, as God's Priest; for Facob's erecting an Altar to God at Salem, Gen. xxxiii. 20. and for his Vow at Bethel, to fet up a Stone Stone for a Pillar to be God's House, and consecrating it with Oil, and a Drink-offering; and also, giving the Tenth of all his Stock to God, Gen. xxviii. 20; Sc. and xxxv. 14. About the Pillar, indeed, an after Command he had to perform, but not to vow. Against the Moral Law they could not act in these Matters, because God accepted of their Acts. But if it be suggested, That a Command they had, tho' it be not recorded in holy Writ; I retort upon them their own beloved Maxim out of Tertullian: Negat Scriptura, quod non notat; The Scripture denies what it does not affirm. And let them make the most of it they can to their own Advantage.

Advantage.

II. It is cast in our Teeth at every turn of That from the Practice of God's Church in giving the Passover to Infants, it may as well be inferred, That Infants should communicate in the Lord's Supper, as we infer Infant Baptism from the Circumcision of Infants. Also, in some of the primitive Times, the Lord's Supper was administred to Infants, with the Approbation of the Fathers of the Church. But,

Church did eat the Passover. I am sure that Place of Exod. xii. 26, 27. which is quoted for it, does not prove it. For of Age those Children were to ask and to understand Questions about its Nature and Uses; nor is it there said, that they did eat the Passover, but only examined what it meant. And tho, v. 3, 4. the Preparation for that Feast in the Paschal Lamb, was to be according to the Household, or the Number of Souls contained in the Family; yet, that might be understood only of such Souls as were qualified to eat thereof.

. 7 5

2. If Infants did eat of the Passover, the Inference will not hold, that they ought now to eat the Lord's Supper, as it holds from their Circumcision to their Baptism. For the Passover was not a Patriarchal Institution, nor Part of the Evangelical Covenant made with Abraham; but a Mosaical Ordinance, instituted about Two Months before the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, to commemorate a particular Blessing or two vouchsas'd by God to the Fews alone. And it is not from Moses; but from the Fathers, we derive our Evangelical Privi-

leges.

3. I am of the Opinion, that the Passover did not typify the Lord's Supper, but his Passon: For Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, I Cor. v. 7. Therefore, as the Correspondence does not hold between the Two Ordinances, so neither will the Argument hold from the one to the other. Especially, considering that the Passover was not a Patriarchal, but a Mosaical Institution. I know that some of any very Learned Brethren of the Clergy are of another Mind, and believe, that the Passover typissied the Lord's Supper. But 'till I see it proved, I have no cause to alter my own Opinion, which, I think, is grounded on better Reasons. However, I can pass this by, for I lay not much Stress upon it.

4. Baptism being an Admission into the Church of Christ, and in God's Hands the Instrument of our New Birth, signing Remission of Original Sin, and ingaging for Sanctifying Grace, according to the Measures of Time, and the Proportion of the present Faculties; serves for all the Ends of Grace, that Insants and Children stand in need, or are capable of in their Minority. But when grown up to the Exercise of Reason, they have need of stronger Nourishment, and new Supports against the Assaults of their ghostly Enemies, and the Decays of Grace

occasioned by actual Sins; which is accordingly administred in the Lord's Supper, as it is also by Prayer, Exhortation, Reproof, and other Affistances. Likewife, in that Supper, they renew their Baptismal Covenant; and, after preceding Laples bring themselves under fresh Engagements to perform its Conditions, thro' the Grace that is there expected and afforded. None of which is necessary and part of it not proper or convenient, before they commit actual Sin, and impair their Baptismal Graces by the Follies of their riper Years. Where fore,

5. If the ancient Church, with the Fathers Approbation, gave the Eucharift to Infants, they only did what was vain and needless; not what was unlawful. A pure Mistake, a harmless Error in Practice, it might be, but no Guilt, or unpardonable Transgression. For as Infants had no need of that Sacrament, and as they could not understand its Nature and Obligations, Uses and Benefits, so they could not prostitute or profane it by Misbehaviour. And therefore, if to them it was unprofitable, yet

it was not hurtful.

St. Cyprian, in his Tract De Lapsis, informs us of this remarkable Passage. "A young Girl, with-"out her Will and Knowledge, because not of Age "to understand and give Consent, was profaned by an Idol Sacrifice. Afterwards being offered " the Communion of our Lord's Body and Blood, " fhe refused it by Divine Instinct. And when it "was forced by the Deacon into her Mouth, the "cast it out again with strange Vomitings and "Strainings So great was the Power and Majefty of God So that holy Bishop and Martyr, of which he fays he was an ocular Witness. From whence we gather, that the Communicating of Infants was not ordinarily fuch a wicked and facrilegious Act as some imagine. Why else did not God teftify

testify his Displeasure and Abhorrence of it, in such a visible Manner, as in this Instance, when it was profaned, tho without the Child's Fault; but suffer'd the Church to proceed in a criminal Practice? His patient Toleration of it in other Cases, shews, that he counted it no great Offence, if any at allight

Was our Adversaries Deduction therefore good, that upon the same Ground we baptize Infants, we should also give them the other Sacrament? What would they gain hereby, but only oblige us to give them both: And, for my own Part, I should be much sooner induc'd to communicate them, than to leave them unbaptized. For in that I should only do what was unprofitable and superfluous; in this I should do what I am persuaded is highly injurious to helpless Infants. And if in Conscience I believed, tho upon wrong Principles, as the Fathers did, that I was bound to give them the Lord's Supper, I trust the Error would be pardonable. The Qualifications of Self-Examination, difcerning the Lord's Body, &c. I should apply only to adult Persons, as we do the Conditions in Baptism, and as the fews did in Circumcision.

III. Great Account is commonly made of John's rejecting the Pharifees and Sadduces Claim to Baptism; We have Abraham to our Father, Matt. iii. 9. Hence they conclude, the Abrahamical Covenant not to be the Evangelical, because that gave Abraham's Seed a Birth-right to the Seal, which is denied to hold good under the Gospel Dispensation. A Descent and Birth from believing Parents, is not therefore a sufficient Title to Baptism ; but they that claim it, must be otherwise qualified. And another Use is made of Fohn's Baptisin, that concerns the Manner of Administration on owner w

Whether John did finally refuse to baptize those Pharifees and Sadduces, or not, is to me indifferent; 11 613

But I deny the Baptism of Fohn and Christ, to be effentially the same. And then no Argument can be rais'd from the one unto the other. For if they differ'd in their Nature and Essence, they might differ in the Mode of Administration and other Circumstances. The Proof lies on them who hold the Affirmative; but I will gratifie them this one time in proving a Negative, to prevent all Cavils, and let them fee, that I deny not without Reason. The Matter, or outward Element, which was Water, was the fame in both Baptisms. But this will not prove an Identity in the Ordinances, or an essential Agreement. For not the Matter, but the Forms, internal or external, give a specific Difference or Agreement unto things. Then I say, that the Baptisms of Fohn and Christ differ'd in both the Forms, and also in their Uses, Ends and Designs.

1. They differed in their internal Forms, provided John's had any such Form at all. For the internal Form of Christ's Baptism, consists in the Operation of the Spirit upon the Soul, to wash off its Pollution by regenerating Grace, and to seal the Remission of Sins. But we do not read, that John in his Baptism, promis'd those Effects, only he bound the Persons baptiz'd to Confession and Repentance; whereupon their Pardon and Sanctification follow'd. So that these Effects were not annex'd to his Baptism; but to his Doctrine, and to their Repentance. For John baptiz'd with Water, but Christ with the Holy Ghost.

2. They differed in their external Forms: What Form of Words *John* used in his Baptism, is not recorded, tho' we may suppose he used some. But we are sure he used not the same that Christ has commanded us to do in his; which runs in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Of the Holy Ghost *John* made no mention in his Baptism. Otherwise the Disciples baptiz'd by him, could not have answered and said of themselves; We have not so much

de beard whether there be any Holy Ghoft, Acts xix. 2. Neither did he baptize in the Name of Jesus: Else St. Paul would not have order'd those Disciples to be baptiz'd again in that Name, v. 5. Whereas Fohn only charg'd in his Doctrine, that they should believe on him that should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus, v. 4. If John's Baptism and Christ's had been specifically the same, here was an Apostolical Warrant given for Re-Baptization, or re-iterating the same Baptism, to the same Persons, which is never allow'd. For nothing can be plainer, than that those Disciples were re-baptiz'd, whom Fohn had baptiz'd before. 'Tis faid of Apollos, that he knew only the Baptisin of John, Acts xviii. 25. Which clearly intimates, that beside that, there was a Baptism of another Species.

3. The Use, End and Design of Christ's Baptism, was to make Disciples to himself of all Nations, Sexes, and Ages too, as we believe, and thereby to admit them into his Church in general: As the Fews us'd to do their Proselytes by Circumcision of the Males, and by Baptism and Sacrifice to all. But the Design of John's Baptism, was to make a particular Sect of Disciples to himself, out of the Church and Nation of the fews alone. Thefe, after his Example, were to lead a Life that confifted in Abstinence, Rigor and Severity, that they might be the better prepar'd and disciplin'd to entertain the Messas. Members of God's Church Fobn's Disciples were before by Circumcifion: Adult Persons they might only be, because they alone were fittest for his purpose; and perhaps none but Males. For tho? he might preach openly unto all, yet we do not read of any Females, Infants and little Children, among his select Disciples. But herein I will not be positive.

At that Time the Covenanting and Incorporating Ordinance by God's Law, was not Baptism, but Circumcifion. So the Pharisees and Sadducees had

been

been circumcifed before into the Abrahamical Covenant in their Infancy, and were acknowledged for Members of the true Church of God. And as flagitiously wicked as they were, their Infant Children had still a Right to the same Privileges, because born of Parents that were profess'd Believers, and visibly within the Church and Covenant. John therefore denied none of those Rights, nor could he do it with Truth and Justice. But the Fathers being of Age, and great Sinners, and yet desiring to be admitted into the Profession of a strict Holiness, it was necessary for John to abate their vain Considences, and oblige them to true Repentance, before they could receive the Benefits they expected.

It was not therefore Admission into the Church and Covenant, (wherein they had been long before by the proper Ordinance) that they desir'd, and Fohn denied. But he denied their Title to true Holiness and Salvation, barely on the Account of their being Abrabam's Children, and the like external Privileges. So did the Prophets, and fo did Christ to the circumcifed, but finful Jews. So did the Apostles, and so do we to all Baptized Christians that are of Age, and live in Sin. May we not rebuke their Vices, and remonstrate the Folly and Vanity of their idle Confidences, without being suppos'd to Unchurch or Un-covenant them, and absolutely deny their Claim to the external Privileges of Church Communion, into which they were Baptiz'd? When, God in Ifa. 1. and elsewhere, heavily tax'd the Fews with their wicked Lives and Hypocritical Devotions, whereof he express'd his utmost Abhorrence, declaring their Services to be not only fruitless, but detestable, and their Privileges vain; did he thereby quite Un-church them, and place them visibly in the State of Heathens? No; but unworthy Citizens will enjoy their external Rights both Civil and Ecclefiaftical, till they come under Judicial Sentences, and are formally depriv'd or suspended by Authority.

4. As we teach, there is an Engagement, Vow and Sacred Oath, brought on Infants in their Baptism: And this without their Consent or Knowledge, and as others fay, without Insurance of Grace to perform the Engagement; which does therefore necessarily involve them in the Guilt of Perfidiousness, Perjury, and fuch horrid Crimes. This is hotly declaimed against as a Snare to Souls, and as a voluntary Vow condemned, Mat. v. 34. upon which come the Tragical Out-cries; "O perjur'd Nation! perjur'd " People! and perjur'd Pastors! For so are all de-" bauched, drunken, swearing and unclean Teachers. " Are not these perjur'd also? Have they kept their " Vow and Covenant? &c." Keach, Bel. Bapt. difplay'd, p. 270. which we had before also in his Rector Rectified. Nor can honest Daniel Williams, though a diffenting Brother, escape the Lash, for his lamentable Doctrine about that Oath. But to the great Comfort of baptized Infants, the Vow is pronounced void, and they are clean absolv'd from all Obligations, by a Sentence no less decretory and definitive, than if it were Prætorian or Pontifical. So their charitable Advocate, but our Severe Judge, Mr. Benjamin Keach.

But voluntary Vows and Oblations were approv'd of under the Law: There also good Kings brought themselves and People under the Engagement of such Vows to serve God, and obey his Commandments; as David swore he would keep his righteous Judgments, Psal. cxix. 106. and Nehemiah made them enter into a Curse and an Oath for the same End,

Neh. x. 29.

I am of Opinion, that Christ has not prohibited all voluntary Vows and Oaths, in the fore-cited place of St. Matthew. For I think such a Prohibition would infringe the Natural Right and Obligations we have to devote ourselves to God's Service. Surely, I find in myself a natural inherent Power, and think

it also my Duty, to dispose of my self to God's Worship with a willing Mind. Promise and resolve I may to perform my Religious Duties; and what I can safely promise, I can vow and swear, when I think it requisite; tho this is a stricter Bond, and the Breach thereof more criminal. Nothing do we in fuch Vows, but ingage ourselves strongly to what is already our indispensible Duty upon Pain of Damnation. And why may not Infants and little Children be brought under the same Engagements, which bind them to no more than what they are absolutely bound to all their Days by the Laws of God? No Sins of theirs will be counted perfidious Violations of their Vow, but those that are wilful, and therefore imputable to themselves as their free Choice. In Civil Affairs, Parents act for their young Children, and Trustees for their Pupils. And when those Acts are apparently for the Minor's Profit, the Law will justify them, and oblige to Performance, as is well known, and daily practifed. The fame will hold in Matters of Religion, which infinitely make for the Childrens Advantage. Here is no Snare laid, but Salvation projected for their Souls: Or, if insnar'd they be, it is afterwards thro' the treacherous Consent and free Election of their own Will.

But after all, what if God himself brought them under the same Vow and Covenant so long ago as the Days of Abraham, and by his Command oblig'd them to stand to it thro' all Generations? And what if he advanced this Covenant into an Oath, Deut. xxix. 12. wherein the Fathers must consent and stipulate for their Little Ones, and the Living for those that were not yet in Being? v. 15. This I affert to be the very Truth. Then all the profane Thunder and Lightning that is slassify out against our Practice, slies in the Face of God, whose Precedent we follow, and whose Precept we obey. Nor

is it so hard a Case, to bring unconsenting Infants under the easy Yoke of Christ's gracious Covenant, as it was to bring them under the unsupportable Yoke of Bondage to Moses his Law, as our Adversaries say Circumcission did. I will say nothing of Grace to perform the Covenant, which is always sure on God's side.

5. In order to destroy our Birth-Right to the Seal of the Covenant, upon the old Abrahamical Foundation, we are told near a hundred times over; That no Man is now to be known ofter the Flesh; but old Things are passed away, and all Things are become new, 2 Cor. v. 16, 17. All I shall reply to this, is, That the Covenant of Grace made with Abraham, and the Right which the Infants of believing Parents have in it, will never pass away. Those Words of the Apostle are, therefore, grossy understood, or mis-applied; but, in their true Sense, are nothing at all to our Adversaries Purpose.

To what is already faid upon this Argument, I shall add Two Observations more, which have been

often urged by Padobaptifts.

1. When we confider how difficult the Fews were to part with their ancient Privileges and Customs, we can hardly believe, that upon their Conversion to Christianity, they would easily part with the old Covenant Privileges for their Children. Every body knows how stiffly they stood for Circumcision, and how zealous they were for the Rites of the Law. Now, if by turning Christians, they had seen all their Infants quite dif-privileged, excluded from the Church and Covenant, and treated as the Children of Heathens in those respects, who, in their Accounts, were no better than unclean Dogs; we cannot believe they would ever have taken it so patiently, as not once to open their Mouths on that Occasion. Probably the Difficulty of making them Christians, or retaining them in the Church on fuch a Term, had

Abraham to Christ, the Children and Infants were proselyted with their Parents, and admitted Members of the Church. The Gain of the one, was the others Gain. But now, by becoming Christians, their Infants and little Children, who were in the Church of God before, are turned out. And so the Parents Gain was their Loss. Strange! that this should be the Effect of God's Grace, and Christ's meritorious Passion, to un-church the young Children of so many Thousand converted fews! And no less strange, that those fews should forget their usual Stiffness, Murmurs and Tumults, and bear it quietly! This makes the Account appear highly improbable, if not incredible. I could not forbear to mention it cursorily, the others have insisted on it more at large.

2. It was a Custom among the Jews, in our Saviour's Time, and before, to baptize the Converts to their Religion, and with the Parents to baptize their Infants. This Custom Christ is supposed to have transcribed into his Church, and that the Apostles observed it in making Disciples. For they baptized several whole Families; among whom, it is most probable, there were some Infants, or young

Children.

The Truth and Matter of Fact relating to that Fewish Baptism, has been of late denied and opposed. I think Sir Norton Knatchbul was the first that broke the Ice, and ventured upon this Denial. But what he has said to disprove it, is very weak and inconsiderable; and his first Argument concludes strongly against himself. Others have followed him, and especially Mr. Gale spends Two long Letters upon the Subject. So consident is he of Success, "That he is inclin'd to venture the Matter upon this Issue, and almost make a Promise to unite with the Establish'd Church, if it can be proved, that

" the Jews baptized the Infants of their Proselytes " before and at the Time of Christ's sending out his "Disciples." For to this Effect are his Words,

Let. VI. p. 222.

As I have not laid Infant-Baptisin on this Base or Foundation, fo I am not oblig'd to follow our Author Step by Step in a full Answer to what he has advanced on this Article. With the Rabbinical Writings I am not much acquainted, nor need I ever defire to be, if his Judgment and Censures of them be just. However, his Arguments that seem to me. to have any Strength, I shall briefly examine, and return what I think sufficient to overthrow them, and confirm the Truth of the Jews Baptism.

I. He owns; "'Tis considerable, that so many "Learned Men favour the Opinion; but it will ap-" pear from the Reasons they give for it, that they were too credulous, and entertained it too easily; "which leffens their Authority very much, Let. "IX. p. 325." They did not only favour it, but they affirmed it for a certain Truth, and infifted upon it. And it is to be supposed, that when so very many of the most Learned Writers in Europe have confidently afferted and published it before the World, they had well weighed and confidered the Matter. Nor were any Men more conversant than feveral of them, with the Works of the Rabbies. "Yet were they not only too credulous, but, by " Mr. Gale's Account, guilty of the greatest Folly " and Madness in the World, to believe, as they " did, this, or any thing else, upon the sole Au-" thority of the Rabbies, p. 334." Fine Compliments from a polite and Scholar-like Pen, to no less Men than Hammond, Taylor, Whithy, Selden, Puffendorf, the admirable Grotius, the incomparable Lightfoot, as he calls them, and many other Authors of the most eminent Note, who have given into that Persuasion upon the sole Authority of the Rabbies!

If Mr. Gale's Judgment be right, such Places as Bedlam had been sittest to entertain those distracted Heads; and their Books should rather see the Flames, than be kept in Studies and Libraries for Perusal.

2. He tells us, "That Mr. Wall's Authorities "do not prove the fews Baptism to be practised in "Christ's Time, much less before it, p. 325." Do they not, indeed? Will Mr. Gale stand by this? Yes, he does, and affirms it over and over, p. 328. Again, p. 333. And again, p. 334. Let us, therefore, be now tried by Mr. Wall's Authorities, and hear what they say, to see if Mr. Gale can possibly

be justified or excused.

In Mr. Wall's Quotation, "Maimonides fays of " the Fews Baptism, It was so in all Ages; and " cites Scripture for it as old as Moses, Numb. xv. " 15. As you are, so shall the Stranger, or Proselyte, " be. How are you? (speaking to the native Fews) " By Circumcifion, and Baptism, and Sacrifice. " So likewise the Stranger, thro' all Generations, " by Circumcision, and Baptism, and bringing of a "Sacrifice." The Talmud, Tit. Repud. says, "Fe-" thro, Moses's Father-in-Law, was made a Prose-" lyte by Circumcifion, and Immersion in Waters." Was not that before Christ's Time? Also, they ground the Practice of that Baptism upon Exod. xix. 10. as Mr. Gale knows: but how rightly, is not my Business to inquire. And so, in their Opinion, it mnst be very ancient, since they thought the Law was for it. Whereupon Maimonides affirms, "Bap-" tism was in the Wilderness just before the giving " of the Law." Again, says the Talmud, Tit. Cherithoth, c. 2. " It was the way whereby the Fathers " were incovenanted." Meaning the Fathers of the old Times. All which made the incomparable Lightfoot use these Expressions of the Times, at and before Christ; "Padobaptism in the Fewish Church,

in the Admission of Proselytes, was so known, usual and frequent, that nothing was more known, " usual and frequent, Hor. Heb. on Matt. iii. 6." Than whom, and the great Buxtorf; we have Mr. Gale's Word, "That none ever better under-" flood," nor were more universally acquainted with the Rabbins and their Writings, p. 350."
Here then is one Instance of Mr. Gale's Candor and Ingenuity, in representing his Adversaries Quotations and Authorities, on whom he so often smartly reflects for the like Management. And, I think, this, and feveral other Instances of the same Nature. should very much lessen his own Credit and Authority. But.

3. The Rabbins were too late to bear authentic Testimony to the Baptism of their Church, which is faid to be in Use in and before Christ's Time. For the Mischna, the ancientest Part of the Tal-" mud, was compil'd 150 Years after the Destruction of Ferusalem; another Part of it 230 Years, and a third 500 Years after Christ, p. 326. Alfo, Maimonides and R. Solomon lived in the 12th Century. But, certainly, very poor Antiquaries must those Talmudists be, if they knew not what was the common Custom of their Church in an injtiatory Ordinance, or whether there was any fuch thing in Use, but 2 or 300 Years before their Days. As now those Men would be mean Historians, who among us should set up for Ecclesiastical Writers; and yet did not know, whether or no Infant-Baptism was practised in our Church at the Reformation and before.

But Maimonides in particular, tho' a great Man, has his Evidence excepted against, as a late "incompetent Witness, who could know no more than we do, what was the Usage of his Church in " our Saviour's Days; and, therefore, must not be

" credited on his bare Word, without producing

much older Authority. And might not he have such Authority, the he thought not himself oblig'd to produce it, because the Case was uncontestable? But here Mr. Gale himself is kind to help us out, by acknowledging, That Maimonides had the Authority of the Talmud and Wise Men of old, for his Tradition of the Proselyte Baptism in Dispute, Let. X. p. 390. And, I trust, an older Evidence than the Talmud will be produced for it very soon.

4. Mr. Gale, I think, endeavours rather to infi-nuate than persuade, that the Fewish Baptism was not initiatory, but purgative; or a bare cleanfing with Water from the Blood of Circumcifion, which was thought polluting; and the Mischna may mean no more, Let. IX. p. 328. Right! if the washing away that Blood was initiatory, and made Profelytes. For the Baptism the Talmud speaks of, did so; as that Fethro was made a Proselyte by Circumcifion and Immersion in Waters; and that it was the way whereby the Fathers were incovenanted. And in Mr. Wall's first Citation, The Proselyte, when circumcifed, was baptized in the Presence of Two Wise Men, &c. And was their Prefence required at the Purification from the Blood of Circumcifion? Let Mr. Gale prove that. But to the making of Profelytes it was. Nor can he understand, how a Person could be wash'd with Two different Washings at one and the same Time. Therefore, there was but one washing of the Blood used. A knotty Problem, indeed, for a Wise Man to be startled at! For if he could not be twice wash'd in the same Instant of Time, might he not be so wash'd in the same Hour, or in the same Day? Mr. Gale has with much ado proved, That the Fews had another Baptism or Washing at their Circumcision: Therefore, that must be the Initiatory Baptism mentioned by the Talmud and Rabbins; or, therefore, they had no such Initiatory Baptism for Proselytes. Here is the Consequence; for he has proved nothing else. Tis like our Author may think it impossible for him to trifle, that being the Monopoly of the Padobaptists: Otherwise, here might

be fomething like it.

4. But in p. 329, &c. he says of that Baptism; The Antiquity of the Practice is rendred dubious " by the Disagreement of the Rabbins. Some plain-" ly affert it, and others as plainly intimate, they neither knew nor allow'd of such an Initiatory "Ceremony." The Ignoramus Jury, and negative Voices, are, for Brevity's sake, reduced to Two; and the only One of them that speaks something to the Purpose, is most grievously stigmatiz'd by Mr. Gale himself, which, I suppose, is not to raise the Credit of his Testimony. "For an anonymous "Author he is that wrote the ancientest Nizza"chon, who, with his usual Gall, would expose
"Baptism as absurd and foolish." But what is it that he would expose? Not the Jews, but the Christians Baptisin. Against the former he speaks not a Word, that I can see: But Mr. Gale forces it from him by fuch Deductions as the Author might not think of. But had he spoken ever so full and. plain to the Point, the Character Mr. Gale gives him, had spoil'd all, and utterly ruin'd his Reputation. For, fince that Author wrote with his usual Gall, trifled, blasphemed, and was an idle, cavilling, quarrelsome Jew; Why might he not be an impudent Liar too? And fince he wrote with fuch a bitter invenom'd Spirit against Christianity, Why might he not resolve to stab our Church, tho' it were thro' the Sides or Bowels of his own? And why might he not maliciously conceal or deny the Jews Baptisin, that he might have better Room to fait his Poylon at those of John and Christ?

Somewhat oddly it may look in an Author, to give fo much Credit to one spiteful and infamous Writer among the Rabbies, as to take his single Testimony against all the rest of them. Will he upon his Authority believe the *Jewish* Baptism to be a Sham, or at least of no Antiquity? When that virulent Jew liv'd and wrote, I know not: But his Words, if they fignify any thing in Mr. Gale's Favour, speak as strongly against the controverted Baptism in his own Time, as in our Saviour's. And so if late he liv'd, it seems there was none at all, notwithstanding older Testimonies of better Men. What does Mr. Gale mean, by producing fuch Evidence against us. unless it be to banter us out of that Right we claim to common Sense, and treat us indeed as Fools and Idiots? Will he himself deny, that there either is or was fuch a Baptism among the Jews in later Ages? I dare engage he will not. Yet if that nameless Author speaks Truth, and is on his side, there was no fuch Baptism in his Days, any more than in the Days of ourBleffed Lord. Must he be credited against all the Tribe, when he is owned to be a shameless Writer? Be the Rabbies as bad as Mr. Gale represents them, yet it is to be hop'd Maimonides, that great Man, and some few more that bear witness to the Jews initiatory Baptism, were more honest and reputable Writers than the scandalous Nizzichon. But if the Intent of this is to shew, that none of all the Rabbies deserves Credit, because one contradicts the rest; at this Rate no Authors in the World can maintain their Reputation, except those that were divinely inspir'd.

The other Negative Evidence is R. Isaac, who expresses himself against the Christians in these Words:

"They have abrogated Circumcisson, and substituted Baptisminits stead; as they have likewise done the Sabbath, instead of which they observe the first Day of the Week." This says Mr. Gale, is exceeding

" of the Week." This, fays Mr. Gale, is exceeding

" plain; for as they kept a new Day instead of the " ancient one, so he fays, they have in the like " manner substituted a new Ceremony of Initiation " instead of the old one." Not so exceeding plain neither; for R. Isaac says nothing of a new Ceremony, but it is Mr. Gale's own Gloss and Comment. It might be old therefore for all this, and the Christian Baptism have succeeded to it, as well as to Circumcision. which alone the Christians, in the Rabby's Expressions. had abolish'd. But the Fews Baptism, he neither affirms nor denies, and his bare Silence is no Argument for or against it. When two Rites are jointly us'd for the same End, he that abrogates one. and appoints the other to serve for both, may be truly and properly faid to substitute one instead of two. As he that imploys two Servants in one Business, if afterwards he thinks one sufficient, and discharging the other, lays all the Burden on one alone, may be faid to substitute him, in his room, and in his own too, without any Impropriety of Speech at all. For now he has double Duty, upon his Hands. which was not fo before.

Mr. Gale goes on arguing; "R. Isaac complains. " The Christians have abolish'd the whole Law, and " all the Divine Precepts which the Law makes neces-" fary, except only fome things in relation to Incest, " &c. Here he enumerates some of the Moral Pre-" cepts, but does not mention Baptism at all." From whence Mr. Gale concludes, that in R. Isaac's Judgment, Baptism was no Institution of Moses, nor practis'd by the Jews before Christ, because he does not except it among the Rites, which the Christians had not abolished. Very acutely and judiciously obferved! R. Isaac enumerates the Moral Precepts of the Law, which the Christians had not abolish'd, and what a Fool was he, that he did not place Baptism among those Moral Precepts? Or, what great Necessity was there, he should take it for a Divine Infti tution

Institution by Moses, and not a meer Tradition of the Elders? But if the legal Washings and Ablutions, with several others invented by the fews, were called Baptisms, as the Gospel teaches, and Mr. Gale acknowledges, how in his Opinion should R. Isaac aver, there was no Baptism at all in use among his Countrymen before Christ? For his Words conclude against all, if against one. This is a Question for Mr. Gale to resolve.

But suppose these two Rabbies were in Mr. Gale's Interest, will their Evidence alone, render the Fews initiatory Baptism dubious? Then I believe it will be hard to prove the Canon of the New Testament. and justify all the Parts of it, we now receive to be genuine and authentic; feeing the Proof of it lies chiefly, if not wholly, upon the Testimony of the Church and ancient Writers. For Mr. Gale may know how long it was, before that Canon was perfeetly fettled and completed: And he may know what great Authors among Christians, as well Ancient as Modern, have question'd, if not denied, the Authority of some Pieces in the Canon. If therefore, his present Argument will do Service against Infant Baptism, let him take care it does no Service for Deifts and Infidels, against the Holy Scripture. Com a mel it if it is ownered and

5. That we have no Evidence for the Jews initiatory Baptism, to be in use as early as Christ's Time, is our Adversaries Position; and if we can prove it, they dare almost venture to promise Conformity with the Establish'd Church: What I shall now observe may call upon them; to mind that Promise, had they made it without Reserve. For we have unquestionable Authority for that, which is much earlier than the Mischna, and comes up full to the Apostolical Age; may, and will affert the Practice for a long time before.

The Disputes of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua about it, are as good a Proof of the Usage of it, in their Time, and before that, as our present Disputes about Infant Baptisin, are a Proof that such a Baptism is now in use, and has been so a considerable. time among some Christians, provided that Padobaptists will be allowed the Name. R. Eliezer did no more deny the Use and Lawfulness of Baptism, in initiating Proselytes, as some pretend he did, than R. Foshua did that Use of Circumcision: Only the first would not grant it to be the sole or chief Ceremony, that made the Proselyte, but ascrib'd that Effect to Circumcifion, which the other denied, and gave to Baptisin. This was the Contest then manag'd between the two Rabbies; namely, about the Virtue, Efficacy, Dignity and Precedence of the two Rites, as will appear prefently from their Words; not about their Being and Lawfulness, which both supposed and allow'd. And so did the Wisemen. that decided the Controversy against them both, and gave their Sentence equally in Favour of the two Ordinances. For, furely, they would not have given it for Baptism, nor levell'd it with Circumcisson, if Baptism was not then in common Practice, or they thought it a very late and novel Invention.

Let us therefore, first settle the Time when those two Rabbies liv'd, and then recite the Words of their Dispute, with the Determination of the Judges. Sir N. Knatchbul, makes them Co-temporaries with Josephus the samous Historian of the Jews. The Learned Author, who wrote the Book call'd, The Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians, whom I suppose to have been Dr. Allix, says from the Megillah, c. 1. that Onkelos composed his Targum under the Conduct of R. Eliezer and Joshua, after the Year of our Lord 70. about which Time Josephus slourish'd, Ch. vii. p. 86. And the same Epoche, does Mr. Stennett somewhere give them, in his An-

fwer

fwer to Mr. Russen. So I hope the Time wherein they lived will stand uncontroverted. Here then are Two Witnesses, besides the Class of Judges, for the Fews initiatory Baptism, living in the Apostolical Age, about Forty or Fifty Years after Fohn and Christ had instituted their several Baptisms. And, probably, they must be born at that Time, or thereabout, since it required in them a considerable Age to become chief Disputants and Masters in Israel, and Guides to Onkelos in composing the

Targum.

The Words of these Two Rabbies concerning the Profelyting Ordinance, and the Definitive Sentence of the Wise Men, Mr. Wall gives us in his Introdu-Clion, p. 27. out of the Gemara, Tit. Feoamoth, c. 4. "Of him that was circumcifed, and not baptized, " R. Eliezer said, that he was a Proselvte. Be-" cause, said he, we find of our Fathers (Abraham, " Isaac, &c.) that they were circumcised, but not " baptized. And of him that was baptized, and " not circumcised, R. Joshua said, that he was a " Proselyte; because, said he, we find of our Mo-" thers, that they were baptized, and not circum-" cifed. But the Wise Men pronounced, That 'till " he were both baptized and circumcifed, he was not a Profelyte." This then is a plain Testimony of the Two Rabbies, and Decision of the Wise Men, for the Practice of Initiatory Baptism among the Fews long before our Saviour's Time. Abandoned of Shame must our Antagonists be, when they produce it as an Evidence against the Practice. And Mr. Gale himself cannot forbear to flur it slightly over, by faying, "That both those Rabbies do " controvert the Baptism of Proselytes, Let. X. " p. 389." Which is very false; for both owned the Baptism, tho' one disputed its Preference to Circumcifion in making the Profelyte.

Could R. Folhua be understood to mean what he fays of their own immediate Mothers; those Two Women must have been baptized before John and Christ had begun their Baptisms. But as it is like they were not Profelytes, and therefore, perhaps, not baptized at all, the Jews, as is faid, using not to baptize Natives; so that cannot be R. Foshua's Meaning. For who knows not, that the common Use of the Word Fathers in Scripture, and the Rabbies, imports their ancient Predecessors so long before, as to run up their Original to Moses and the Patriarchs? And fo in Rabbi Eliezer's Words, Abraham, Isaac, &c. are meant, or expresly mentioned. And to them Mothers are opposed, in the same Sense and Latitude, by his Antagonist. For we cannot think but R. Joshua would strive to vie with his Adversary, in some Degree at least, for the Antiquity of his Ordinance.

If this will not suffice, how easy and obvious had it been for R. Eliezer, who contended for Circumcifion against Baptism, to run down his Opponent into Silence and Confusion, in case Baptisin had been a novel Inflitution? Since you fay, "That " Baptism makes the Proselyte, how can that be "possibly true, when we all know it to be an up"flart Rite of Yesterday's standing in the Church,
"and never used for this Purpose, 'till Two Men, " John and Jesus, about Forty or Fifty Years ago, " within the Memory of many now living, abolish'd Circumcision, as the Proselyting Ceremony, and substituted Baptism in its stead; among their " Disciples? No Knowledge had we of it before in " that Sense, no Use 'till now of late. Will you " then affirm, That all the Converts in former "Times, as the Idumeans in Hyrcanus's Days, " Abafuerus's Subjects in Mordecai's, those in the Reigns of David and Solomon, to name no more, were not Proselytes, because they were only cir-

" cumcised.

"cumcifed, and not baptized? If That you dare not, you cannot do, what Folly and Weakness is it, to maintain Baptism to be the chief, or only Proselyting Rite; when t'other Day, if not to this very Juncture, there was no such a thing with us in Being?" Had this been so, of all the Fools that ever managed a publick Dispute, R. Eliezer had been the greatest, if with this Argument he had not baffled his Adversary, and struck the Wise Men dumb, who determined against him for

Baptism, as well as Circumcision:

Hereupon I should be inclined to flatter myself with a good Historical Evidence for the Antiquity of a Profelyting Baptisin, as a Rite of considerable standing among the Jews before the Time of Christ. and should think it unanswerable; but that I sufpect some brisk critical Head may start up, and pertly ask me; "Pray, Sir, what Authority have "you to believe such a Dispute, as you mention, was ever held by those two Rabbies, and that " the Wise Men gave their decisive Voices in it; nay, that there have been such Persons in the World? Have you the Account recorded in Holy Writ, or the Christian Fathers? Or, do you find it in the polite and creditable Annals of the Greeks or Latins? No, Sir, no; but you have it only from the despicable, ignorant and whims fical Writers of the Fews, whom it is the great-" est Folly and Madness in the World to believe in any thing upon their fole Authority. I therefore regard it no more than I do the Chat of the Beasts and Birds in Æsop's Fables." Should any one thus reply upon me to invalidate my Evidence, what could I do but cross the Cudgels and be quiet? Or, at most, refer my Cause to equitable Judgment, whether this must pass for a fair Refutation? Yet, perhaps, some Persons might like it well enough, when it should come in their Turn to make

make Reprifals. For an expedite Method it is, to fave Disputes about musty Authors, and give a quick and nimble Dispatch to several Controversies.

For,

6. This is Mr. Gale's Method to dispatch the Jewish Rabbies, and render their Testimony of no moment at all for that controverted Baptism. Strange Whimsies, Absurdities, Blasphemies, he lays at their Doors, and proves upon them! Be those true, and abundance more their due in general, yet need they not be all of the same Stamp, nor equally Tristers and Forgers of Lies. When Epimenides characterized his Country-men, "The Cretians are "always Liars;" out of the Number he must except himself, if in that Character he would be credited. It is strange, that the Rabbies should all agree in a known Lie, and deliver it down unanimously thro's fo many Ages to Posterity, while therewas not one honest Man found that would contradict them.

And yet, Suppose they were so wicked, as to deliver for Truth what they knew to be false, how was it possible at first to escape Discovery? The Vulgar's Ignorance and Credulity they might easily abuse with ridiculous, profane and impious Narratives about God, their old Rabbies, and other abstruse Matters, that were far remote from the Peoples Cognizance, and whereof they were, therefore, incompetent Judges. But the baptizing of Proselytes, was a plain Matter of Fact, done in Publick before Witnesses, and continued, as they said, throughout all Ages. But if it was never practised before, nor at the Time when it was first delivered for an old Tradition, every Body of common Sense must know the Falshood.

Beside, it is an approved Rule, Nemo malus gratis: And then let it be shew'd, what Temptation those Rabbies had arising from Prosit, Pleasure,

Repu-

Reputation, Ambition, or the like corrupt Interest, to agree in forming a Fiction of their own Brain, that was hardly passable, if at all, concerning the Initiatory Baptism now in Question. In Stories of another Nature they might propose to themselves to be admired, aggrandized, and blindly followed by the filly People, for Men of Wisdom in Mysteries, or Ability in Wonders. But, in relation to that Baptism, I can see no manner of Motive that

could induce them to Prevarication.

7. Mr. Gale, towards the Close of his 9th Letter, gives the finishing Stroke in parting for the Time with this Subject. His Words are these; " I will " add but one Instance more, which reaches ex-" presly the Thing in dispute, and proves their (the Jews) Traditions, concerning Washings, made void the Law. Mark vii 8 of Laving aside made void the Law; Mark vii. 8, 9. Laying aside " the Commandment of God, ye hold the Traditions
" of Men, as the washing of Pots and Cups; and many other such like Things ye do. And he Said unto them, Full well ye reject the Commandment of "God, that ye may keep your own Traditions. -" making the Word of God of none effect through your "Traditions, which ye have delivered. And our Lord concludes his Censure with these Words, " They are blind Leaders of the Blind, Matt. xv. 14. " All which, if there be any thing facred and aw-" ful, and that deferves our most serious Regard, " in our Saviour's Words, must at least fignify, that " they are a dangerous Sort of Men, and rather to be " shunned than followed. For he expresly commanded us to beware of their Leaven." A little after, Mr. Gale ends, faying, "What is built up-" on this Basis, is a Rabbinical Tradition, and one of those Washings which our Lord condemns; but not a Christian Baptism." So he had told us before, " That by those Washings the Fews had " vacated the Law, Lett. IV. p. 154. The G 3

The Defign of all this, is, to shew, That Christ was so far from approving, imitating, or confirming the fews Initiatory Baptism, that he has utterly condemned it under the general Name of Washings, as a human Tradition that evacuated God's Commandment. But, for this Doctrine, I have a pretty large Reckoning with our Author. For,

I. Mr. Gale strongly denies there was any such Initiatory Baptism in Use and Being among the Jews in our Saviour's Time. How then could Christ condemn it among the other Washings, when it had no Place at all in that List, and no Being among the Jews? Or did it transgress and vacate the Commandment of God in Christ's Time, before it was instituted by the later Rabbies? I never knew 'till now, that Non-Entities could have such wicked Effects, nor deserve such heavy Censures. For Christ plainly taxes the Jews for what they did in his own Time, and not for what they would do in Times following. But,

2. If the Baptism we speak of was in Use among the Fews in Christ's Time, how came he to condemn it as a Tradition that vacated God's Commandment, and withal to retain it in his own Church for the Initiation of Disciples? No Use had it with them, but to admit Proselytes, that I can find; and this Use it has in Christ's Church. If by that Use it transgressed God's Law, must it not do so still? And is this consistent with our Saviour's

Honour?

3. How comes Mr. Gale to find Traditions in that Passage of Scripture, when Christ had put in but one? Both in the Greek and English of St. Matthew's and Mark's Gospels, Christ has only Tradition in the Singular Number; which our Author has changed into Traditions in the Plural. Is it fair in him to take this Liberty with our Saviour's Words, to mis-represent his Meaning, to multiply his

his Accounts, and bring Plurals into his Text inflead of Singulars, in spite of his Expressions and Design? This is a piece of Art which conceals a se-

cret Mystery that shall be detected presently.

4. DidChrist say, That the Fews Tradition about Washings, was the thing that made void the Law? Not a Syllable, nor any thing that implies it. Only he says, That the Fews laid aside the Commandment of God, while they held their own Tradition. The plain English of which must be, That they neglected God's Law, but observed their own Tradition; or they were more regardful of their own Tradition than of his Commandment: which all Men must own to be a great Fault. But,

5. What is really the Tradition of the Fews, which Christ says vacated the Commandment of God? You cannot see a Tittle of it in Mr. Gale's Quotation; but, instead of that, a Chasm drawn over with a Stroke of his Pen. And under it is the Mystery conceal'd I have intimated before. But looking into the Evangelist St. Mark, I have learnt how to disclose and unfold it. For there I clearly see, what Tradition of the Fews it was that did cassate God's Commandment. Twas not that of Washing, but of Corban, which disfers from it toto calo. Let any Body read the 9th Verse down to the 14th, and he will find it just as I say.

the 14th, and he will find it just as I say.

Now if Christ did really mean, that the fews Washings did vacate God's Law, Why did he not instance them, or one fort of them, to prove it, seeing they were most proper, being then directly in Agitation? Why was he content to charge them after another manner, but go clean off from the Subject in hand, to an Instance wholly foreign to that Subject, that he might shew how they transgressed God's Law, and made it void by their Tradition? This was only in the Matter of Corban,

G 4

as is plain in St. Mark; but still, if that could well be, more unexceptionable in St. Matt. xv. 2, &c. because he speaks only of the Corban, but nothing

at all of the *Jews* Washings.

By this time we may perceive what the Stroke of Mr. Gale's Pen, in the foresaid Gap, fignifies. Was it not to impose a gross Fallacy upon us, by hiding fomething from our Knowledge, which was not proper for his Design; but, if known, would utterly defeat and overthrow it? And was it not to make its believe a quite different thing from what our Bleffed Saviour taught? Was there nothing facred and awful, and that deserves our most serious Regard, in our Saviour's Words, but they must be thus mangled and fadly mif-represented to serve a Turn? Is this the Man of Conscience, that schools Mr. Wall without Mercy, when he thinks him guilty of the like Practice but with human Authors; (see an Instance, Let. I. p. 17. about St. Cyprian) and yet takes himself a much worse Liberty with the Word of God? If this be his way of Dealing, he is no more to be trufted than the Rabbies. Verily, was I guilty of fuch Management, I should fear the World would justly take me to be more throughly Jesuited than Christianized. But, I for-The thing is worse than Words can fet it forth, nor is it well capable of Aggravation. Mr. Gale may dawb it with all his Colours, and try to wash it with his utmost Art, he will never come off with clean Hands.

It would be Labour ill bestow'd, to trace him on the same Topic thro' his 10th Letter, where he tries to take off some of Mr. Wall's Authorities for the Fews Initiatory Baptism, produces some negative Evidences against it, and touches upon other Arguments, fuch as he could invent, to disprove it; all which, as he fays himfelf, amount to a Probability on his fide, p. 391. And so let them con-

front

front and destroy better Evidence, if they can; for I will not lose my Time in such an idle Chace; and I know but one thing in it all that deserves a little Animadversion.

For, apprehensive he is of an ill Consequence that will attend our Plea from that Baptism, should it be admitted: "Because it will give our Baptism" to Quakers, Socinians and Libertines; and then, by proving too much, it will prove nothing at all, p. 381. For the Jews baptized only Prosesures, and their Children, at their first coming over to the Church; but no Native Jews, nor the later Posterity of those Proselytes. Whence it follows, that if we keep up to our own Pattern, the Children of Christian Parents must not be

" baptized.

We may fafely pass it, that so was the Practice of the Jews; and for all that, be under no Apprehensions of his Consequence. For the Jews had another initiating Ordinance in Circumcision, which served their Turn for the Admission of their Children into the Church and Covenant from Abraham's Days, and under that Precedent we skreen ourselves in baptizing all our Infants. If our Adversaries will disclaim that Precedent and Warrant, as they openly do, let them look to their own Consequence. For we are safe enough, so long as that stands good in our Behalf.

But to run them a little further into Danger: Their avowed Principle is, To do nothing in Religion of a positive Nature, except they have a Warrant for it from Scripture, Precept or Example. Where have they either of the Two for baptizing the Children of Christian Parents, since they reject our Argument from Circumcision? And where for administring the Lord's Supper unto Females? We have called upon them often enough for Proofs; but, hitherto, all in vain. Does not, therefore, their

The Lawfulness of, &c.

own Principle clearly betray them into Quakerifm? If, then, they cannot produce the Proofs demanded, they should quit their Principle, or their Practice, lest the one slies in the other's Face, and impleads

them guilty of Self-Contradictions.

And here I dismiss the fews Initiatory Baptism, with this Declaration; That when I consider Mr. Gale's Management on That and other Articles; with how much more of Artisce, than Honesty, he shuffles and cuts with all Authors, and all Arguments, I am a little dubious, whether he might not as soon induce me to turn Pyrrhonist as Antirpedobaptist.





THE

LAWFULNESS

F

Infant-BAPTISM,

Proved from

SCRIPTURE.

PART II.

Wind infift undertook this Differtation, I intended to do little more than infift on the Argument for Infant-Bapmical Covenant. For I was not well satisfied with the Management of some Padobaptists that had handled that Matter. In not distinguishing, as they ought, between the Patriarchal and Mosaical Covenant, they argued from the latter, to ground our Dostrine and Practice in baptizing Infants; which was but to betray the Argument to our Adversaries. I therefore thought it needful to put that Affair in a clearer Light, and give it what Advantage I was able. Then I design d in a manner to desist, and add but little from the New Testament.

But now I find a Necessity of altering my Purpose, not only because Mr. Gale and his Party triumph in the Objections they raise against us from the Gospel, which they would persuade the World are unanswerable; but also lest such a wrong Construction should be put on my Procedure, as Mr. Wall's received. His Acknowledgment that the Proofs for Infant-Baptism are not so clear and incontestable in God's Word, but that they may be disputed, and that it was expedient to support them with the Authority of the Primitive Church, emboldened his Antagonist to represent him so, as if he granted, that Infant Baptism could not at all be justified by the Scripture. This Mr. Gale declares in abundance of Places: As in Let. VI. p. 221, 223, 226, 227, 231, 233. and Let. VII. p. 258; and again, Let. XI. p. 395. What he meant by this frequent Repetition of a Falshood is plain to every Body. He was afraid the Reader should forget, that by declining Scripture-Evidence, we give up our Cause before all that adhere to this Rule. This is no less spitefully than artfully done, and is another pregnant Instance of his unfair Dealing. For no fuch thing can be truly deduced from Mr. Wall's Words or Undertaking.

Mr. Gale has peremptorily determined, "That all our Objections and Pretences about Circumcifion, are manifestly invalid for Infant-Baptism; and is persuaded, that if the Clergy themselves would consider the Matter more deliberately, they would be ashamed of all they have urged from this Head, Let. XII. p. 454." I have considered the Matter with all the Deliberation I am Master of, as appears by my Endeavours on that Head. But what Shame I shall merit thereby, I am not yet appriz'd. He has no better Opinion of our Proof from Original Sin; which I shall now consider of,

and deliberately too, before I give it up for despe-

rate. For,

I. With this Argument I shall begin, and lay it at the Foundation of the Gospel Evidences for Infant-Baptism, since it was the unhappy Occasion of the Gospel Oeconomy. For it is my Judgment, that we had never needed a Saviour, Redeemer, or Revelation, but for the miserable Effects of that Sin... And to frame my Argument on this Ground and Plan, I shall accept of the Baptists Concessions concerning the Truth and Nature of Original Sin. Nor need we thank them for those Concessions; for if they had not freely made them, we could very well have commanded and forced them from them.

In their 9th Article of the Christian Faith, they teach Word by Word as our Church doth in the same Article: "Original Sin standeth not in the series of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk) but is the Fault and Corruption of the Nature of every Man, that naturally is ingendred of the Off-spring of Adam, whereby Man is very far gone from Original Righteousness, and is, of his own Nature, inclin'd to Evil: So that the Flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit; and, therefore, in every Person born into this World, it deserveth God's Wrath and Damnation." And so they proceed in our own Language exactly to the End of the Article.

Their Confession of Faith, subscribed by near Forty of their Ministers, in the Name of above an Hundred Baptiz'd Congregations in England and Wales, 1689. is full to the same Purpose; Chap. 6. Sett. 2, &c. "Our first Parents, by this Sin, fell "from their Original Righteousness and Communion with God, and we in them, whereby Death came upon all; all becoming dead in Sin, and whol-"ly defiled in all the Faculties and Parts of Soul

"and Body: They being the Root, and, by God's Appointment, standing in the Room and Stead of all Mankind, the Guilt of the Sin was imputed, and corrupted Nature conveyed to all their Posterity, descending from them by ordinary Gemeration, being now conceived in Sin, and, by Nature, Children of Wrath, the Servants of Sin, the Subjects of Death, and all other Miseries, Spiritual, Temporal and Eternal, unless the Lord Jesus set them free." There is more behind in that Confession; but this is sufficient for our Purpose.

Also their Catechism set forth upon this Confession, in Answer to Quest. 22. presents us with this Doctrine: "All Mankind, by their Fall, lost Communion with God, are under his Wrath and "Curse, and so made liable to all the Miseries of this Life, to Death it self, and to the Pains of Hell for ever." To which I shall add Mr. Gale's Words: "The modern Antipadobaptists do own the Doctrine of Original Sin, as well as the others, "Let. XI. p. 405." Likewise, Let. XIII. p. 535. "It no more follows from that Principle (of Original Sin) that the ancient Church practised Insant-Baptism, than that all the Antipadobaptists do so now; for they likewise hold the common "Notion of Original Sin." When he expresses himself in these universal Terms, All the Antipadobaptists, one would think there could be no Exception, but that he himself, and every Body else of

Case.
Original Sin, with its sad Effects, being thus fully granted, I need not prove it; but go on to raise my Argument from it for Infant-Baptism.

that Denomination, was included; tho' I have fome Reason to suspect the contrary in his own

In Original Sin there are Two Branches, which Infants are concerned in equally with Adult Perfons. One is natural Corruption and Pravity, which stains and pollutes the Soul. The other is Guilt, which renders them obnoxious unto Punishment. Neither of those can be taken off in our lapsed Condition, without the Application of redeeming Grace, which is as necessary for Infants as the Adult.

For, the Corruption of Nature, or the Contagion of Original Sin defiling the Soul, is an inherent Evil; which, according to Scripture, does utterly unqualify us for the Kingdom of Heaven. And fo it must likewise do according to the Baptists Doctrine, which teaches, "That all Adam's Posterity, by ordinary Generation, are the Servants of Sin, " the Subjects of Death, and all other Miseries, "Spiritual, Temporal and Eternal, unless the Lord Jesus set them free." Of such we truly hold with the Word of God, That Corruption doth not inherit Incorruption; That without Holiness no one shall see the Lord; That none that is defiled or unclean. Shall enter into the heavenly City; And, that no one, except he be born again of Water and of the Spirit, can enter into the Kingdom of God; because that which is born of the Flesh is Flesh. It is corrupt, finful, mortal Flesh, like its Principle from which it descends: "Liable therefore to the Sen-" tence of Death past upon all Sinners: Forasmuch " as every Sin deserveth God's Wrath and Curse, " both in this Life, and in that which is to come," fays the Baptists Catechism, Answ. to Quest. 89.

If thus the Case stands, all Persons naturally descended from the First Adam, must be sanctified and regenerated, before they can be admitted into God's Kingdom. Infants cannot be excepted, because they are polluted with the Contagion of Sin; and, as our Adversaries profess, "They are fallen off from

" Com-

"Communion with God, are defiled in all the Faculties and Parts of Soul and Body, are Children
of Wrath, do deserve Damnation, and are obnoxious to the Pains of Hell for ever." Actual
Sin they have not; but without That they have
enough, and too much, for their great Unhappiness.

Let Mr. Gale therefore confider, by what Authority he exempts Infants from this Necessity of Regeneration, and liberally votes them all into Heaven without that Method or Expedient, Let. XI. p. 421. Tho' they may not, in the highest Degree, have the same Necessity for a New Birth with actual Sinners; yet, they have that which appears to be absolute and indispensible. For sick they are to Death with Sin, like other Persons, and the same Disease must have the same Cure: And liable they are to the same Miseries, which accordingly must have the same Remedy; when this Cure or Remedy is but one, as our Saviour says, there is no other. And, I believe, it is not a little dextrous Management will bring a Man off well for contradicting Christ; and this with very slight and superficial Arguments.

How then are Infants born again? Or how are they purified from the Filth of Original Sin, and freed from its Servitude, in order to recover the Favour of God, and to be received into Heaven? We affert, it is by the Baptism of Water and of the Spirit joined together, as the ordinary Means, at least, for that End. But all Christians that are not tinctur'd with Pelagianism, must acknowledge, That it is by the Spirit of Sanctification acting on the Soul to cleanse off its native Impurity, and render it pure and holy in the Sight of God. For is there any other Principle or Source of sanctifying Grace? Any other Fountain of Purification for Sin and Uncleanness to the polluted Off-spring of Adam?

None, certainly, beside the Spirit of God, who commonly works the Effect by the instituted Ordinances and Moral Duties of Religion. Moral Duties Infants cannot practise; but to them the instituted Ordinance of Baptisin may be easily applied. This therefore let them have, since they can have

no more, and it will be their proper Cure.

That Infants may be, and are Regenerated by the Holy Ghost, is no Absurdity, nor can it be a Dissibility with the Baptists. For it is plain enough their own Doctrine, "Elect Infants dying in Infancy," are regenerated and saved by Christ through the "Spirit; who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth, Confession of Faith, Chap. x. §. 3." And for Proofs hereot they direct us to John iii. 3, 5, 6, 8. Nor, as they say, "are any of the Elect justified personally, until the Holy Spirit doth in due Time actually apply Christ unto them, Chap. xi. §. 4." Then if all Infants are in a present State of Salvation, as some of our Adversaries seem to affirm; it follows from hence, that they must be

actually fanctified and regenerated.

But if this Baptism of the Spirit they grant to Infants before they can be justified and saved, they ought not to deny them the Baptism of Water. For then they will be press'd with St. Peter's Question; Can any Man forbid Water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? Acts x. 47. If saved Infants are, the Holy Ghost they must receive in his regenerating and sanctifying Grace; and if him they have received, with Water they must be baptiz'd. But if they have neither the Baptism of Water, nor of the Spirit, what Account can be given for their Salvation?

I confess, the Persons referred to by St. Peter there, had received an extraordinary Measure of the Holy Ghost, as their speaking with strange Tongues testified. But this is alledg'd only as an Evidence of

God's Gift and their Receipt; not as the Reason and Ground of their Right to Baptism with the outward Element. Their having the Holy Ghost, alone, founded this Right and Title to the Sacrament; whereas the higher Degree is made no more a Qualification for it, than a lower. And if any thing could do it, the eminent and miraculous Measure of the Grace, would go furthest to supercede the Necessity of the Ceremony. But this would not suffice; and therefore, this is an irrefragable Argument against the Quakers.

Mr. Gale, by a Skilful Improvement of the Doctrine of all Judicious and Critical Divines; such as Scaliger, Grotius, Le Clerc, Dr. Hammond, &c. has formed to himself such a precise Notion of being Born of the Spirit, as is utterly incompatible with the State of Infants: Let. xi. p. 422. "For they " that are born of the Spirit, must mind the Things " of the Spirit, and obey his Motions by Faith and " Piety. This Infants cannot do, and therefore " they cannot be so born." But what those Divines and Critics fay, they meant only of Adult Persons, which Mr. Gale, with his usual Ingenuity, applies to Infants. So he deals with the Scriptures, Fathers, and other Writers, to disprove their Baptisin: After this rate, we may prove Infants not to be rational Creatures, because they have not the Exercise of their rational Faculties, as other Persons of that Species have; and that there were no circumcifed Infants in the Fewish Church, because they could not love God with all their Hearts, and keep his Commandments, as God required in circumcifed Fews. Regeneration, as it fignifies Growth in Grace, to which the New-Birth, precisely taken, is but the first Step, has various Degrees, which, I think, will not be completely finish'd till we leave the World. Then what Absurdity is it, in the first Step and imperfect Degree, to attribute it unto Infants? Or if, in our Author's Author's Judgment, this cannot be, let him reconcile his Doctrine with that of his Party just now quoted

out of their Confession of Faith.

When Christ urges the Necessity of Regeneration. he grounds it upon fomething that accompanies our Nativity into this World. For this is the Reason he immediately gives: That which is born of the Flesh, is Flesh: To which he opposes the Birth of the Spirit; and that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit. Two Birthsare here plainly in opposition. And when is the First, but when we come into the World? And when the Second, but when we come into the Church, or Kingdom of God? Can Mr. Gale affign another Time, Season, or Juncture for People to be born of the Flesh, beside that of their coming into this World? If he cannot, fomething comes with us all into this World, that makes it necessary for us all to be born of Water and of the Spirit; which, in Mr. Gale's own Sense, is to be baptiz'd and regenerated. Infants are certainly born of the Flesh. and come attended with Original Sin into the World. Therefore have they the like need of Baptismal Regeneration, that others have. For where the Difease is common, let the Cure and Remedy be the fame. The Ground and Reason is in them, which is the Corruption of finful Flesh; and, consequently, the Regeneration must be theirs, or they cannot see the Kingdom of God.

Let Mr. Gale make the most of this he can; we may defy his Criticisins, or little Quibbles, when they come in Competition with plain Gospel Truth. Or, if a Pelagian he really is in this Article, let him fairly throw off the Mask, and take up the Cudgels in that bassled Cause; I trust in God, we shall never

decline the Combat.

The other Branch of Original Sin is Guilt, which infers an Obligation to Punishment. And this is at large confess'd by the Antipedobaptists, who own

H 2

it due to all People, for Adam's Offence, in the utmost Extent of God's vindictive Wrath and Justice. But from this Guilt, which renders all Men obnoxious to eternal Punishment, there is no possible Release, but by the Mediation of Christ Jesus. For as in Adam all die, so in Christ must all be made alive, if ever they recover from that Death: Neither is there Salvation in any other; for there is no other Name under Heaven given among Men whereby we must be saved, Acts iv. 12. Nor can any one come to the Father, but by the Son, who is the Way, the

Truth, and the Life, John xiv. 6.

As this is exceeding plain, so it is no less plain, that every living Soul must have an Interest in Christ Spiritual Fellowship and Conjunction with him, before the Merits of his Death will be applied to him for Grace, Pardon and Salvation. To his Body, the Church, they must some way or other be united, as living Members of the same. For by that means they become united to him, who is the Head of that organized Body. So we read, Christ is the Head of the Church, and he is the Saviour of the Body, Eph. v. 23. Of none else can he be the Saviour, because they have no Relation to, nor Communion with him. From the Head it is that the animal and vital Spirits flow down into the human Body, to quicken and act it in all its Parts; and no vital or fensitive Supply can a Member receive from the Head, when once it is fever'd from the Body. So from Christ, the Head, it is, that all the saving Influences of Grace descend into the Church, his Body; to animate and act every Member of it in his Spiritual State and Capacity. Therefore is he bound to hold the Head, from which all the Body by Foints and Bands having Nourishment ministred, and knit together, increaseth with the Increase of God, Col. ii. 19. Which is also taught in those darker Words. Eph. iv. 16. But if any one abide not in him, he is as

a Branch parted from the Tree, dryed up and withered, John xv. 6. For he that hath the Son, hath Life; and he that hath not the Son, hath not Life, I John v. 12.

Matters standing in this Posture, as God was pleased to order them, it remains for us to enquire, What means he hath appointed to incorporate us into the Body of Christ, that we may thereby communicate in his Grace and Merits? And if the Scripture-Account we will take for this, there is but one regular and ordinary Way, fince Christ died, to be so incorporated. And that is, The Sacrament of Baptism in its full and complete Signification. For so it comprehends the Water and the Spirit; or the outward Symbol and the inward Grace. In which Sense it is properly the Laver of Regeneration. A lame and imperfect Idea they give of it, who represent it only by the external Part, without the interior Form: as if it were as bare and naked a Ceremony as any in the Jews Religion. They had as good, in the Description of a Man, to forget his Soul, as present us with that cripplish Notion of Christ's Baptism. For he always intended that the Administration of it should be accompanied with the regenerating Grace of his Spirit; and it always is, where there is no Obstacle and Impediment on Mens Part.

Baptism is therefore the Gate that lets us into the Church, and unites us to the Body of Christ, as the Church is the Gate of Heaven. By that Ordinance Infants are united to their Saviour, and made Members of his Body. So they have visibly a Covenant-Relation with him by the outward Ordinance, and invisibly by the Spirit. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, Gal. iii. 27. And by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, I Cor. xii. 13. Both the Parts together make the Saving Baptism in St. Peter. So the Work is made very sure to Infants in God's own Method;

and certain we are, they may thus be faved; because they are joyned to Christ, and both the Guilt and Desilement of Original Sin are taken off by the Application of his Merits. The Baptists, following Dr. Taylor, talk of many Ways that God has to save Infants: But can they specify any one of those Ways besides Baptism? Or can they justify it by Revelation and a Covenant Promise? If not, where is their Scripture Warrant for their Dostrine? Will they forsake God's Method, to sollow their own Fancies? This is not Faith, but Presumption; It is not to sollow God, but to lead and teach him. 'Tis a Covenant Security we desire for the Salvation of

Infants, and not the vain Surmises of Men.

For fince they are born under the Guilt and Taint of Sin, there is no Relief for them, but by the Covenant of Grace established in the Blood of Christ; no Insurance of that Covenant, but by the Seal of Baptisin with Water and the Spirit; and without this, there is no Communion with their Saviour. If in their First Birth they are destroyed by Sin, the Second Birth alone must fave them. Regenerated, therefore, they must be by the Holy Ghost, or else from God's Word we have no promising Prospect of their Salvation. For if any one has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his, Rom. viii. 9. But that Spirit is the only inward Bond that unites them to their Saviour: He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit, I Cor. vi 17. He has one Spirit with Christ, which is common between him and all the true Members of his Body. This is the Spirit which inlivens and animates them all, is most properly their Soul as Christians, and puts them in a saveable Condition.

The Spirit of Christ Infants must therefore have, before they can belong to Christ, and be saveed by his redeeming Grace. For there is no other Principle of a new Life to the Lapsed Sons of Adam, and no other Bond of real Union with their Saviour. If this

quick-

quickning Spirit they have not, who can promise them Salvation? But if him they have, who can forbid them Water to be baptized? But in a State of Salvation the Baptists say that Infants are. If so, they are already, by Grace, the invisible Members of his Body. Baptize them, then, and make them visible Members of the same. For are they his, or are they not? If not, where is their Salvation thro' Christ? Or can they be saved, when parted from his Body? that is, without their Head, and without their Saviour? But if his they are, by a gracious Communication of his Spirit, give, prefent and dedicate them to him by Christian Baptism, will he disallow your Act? Will hereject and refuse his own, whom he has bought with his precious Blood, and, according to you, has made already invisible Members of his Body? Agnize their Right and Spiritual Relation to their Head ? Sign them with his proper Mark and Seal? Give them the Baptisin of Water, if you give them that of the Spirit; for in that case, both or none they ought to have. But if you give them neither, never pretend to give them Salvation.

For, tell me, Where and how is Salvation to be had out of the Church, or Christ's Body? Or, what hope of Heaven can they have, who are neither vifible nor invisible Members of that Body? Once this was an Appropriation of the fews, because they alone were God's Church. For Salvation is of the Jews, John iv. 22. Now, for the same Rea-fon, it is appropriated to the Church of Christ; for he is the Saviour of his Body, and of that alone. Therefore are they first added to the Church, who shall be faved, Alls ii. 47. And to the Head they must all hold. Nor is there Salvation in any other, or Life to him that has not Christ. But in what a desperate Case and Condition they all are, who are out of the Church, the H 4 Holy Holy Ghoft informs us by St. Paul's Mouth, Eph. ii. 11, 12. In Time past ye were Gentiles in the Flesh, who are called Uncircumcifion: - during which Time ye were without Christ, being Aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and Strangers from the Covenants of Promise, having no Hope, and without God in the World. And also, 1 Theff. iv. 13. they

are faid to have no Hope.

Wherefore, if all the Gentile World, by being Aliens to the Commonwealth of Ifrael, i. e. out of God's Church, and Strangers to the Covenants of Promise, are in a hopeless Condition for that Reafon, without God and without Christ, from whom alone Salvation cometh; what do those Gentlemen mean, who leave their Infants out of the Church and Covenant, without God and without Christ, in the same hopeless State with Gentiles and Infidels, and dispute hotly for it, as for some singular Privilege and Advantage? Is this their Concern and Affection for the tender Fruit of their own Bowels? Or is this the Right way to insure their Salvation, and intitle them to Heaven, when they place them among the Children of Unbelievers?

What is incumbent on those Gentlemen to shew, is this: They must prove, that Infants being unsanctified out of the Church and Covenant, and laid on the same Level with those of professed Heathens, are there in as hopeful Capacity of Salvation, as those Infants are, who are admitted by Baptisin into Christ's Church and into the Covenant of Grace, and so become united to their Head and Saviour. The Scripture Authorities here produced to the contrary, they must reconcile with their own Opinions by true and unconstrained Interpretations. And if the Force of these Authorities they can fairly evade. then they must bring other Scripture Evidences,

which do more plainly prove the Salvation of Hea-

thens and Infants, that are out of the Church, in the fame

fame State with Heathens, than our Evidences do the contrary. If those Things they cannot do, let them not pretend hereafter to hold and believe with the Holy Scriptures; but confess, that their Faith and Practice are not only un-scriptural, but very directly

anti-scriptural.

It is not what they may hope and presume without Promise or Scripture-Authority, that we can safely rely upon, but what God has declared in his Word to be his Will. Observe his Rules they ought, and not venture to prescribe to his Justice or Mercy what they themselves do think convenient. When Infants are left out of the Church and Covenant, and Salvation nevertheless affured unto them, his Word and Revealed Methods are forfaken, and we are clearly carryed off into the wild Paths of Deism and Natural Religion; by which our Lapsed and Guilty State, we may rather be fure that we shall not be faved, then that we shall. For, take the Baptists Way, and their Warrant for it, then if ye can be fure that the Children of Fews, Turks and Pagans will be faved, you have just the same Security for your own. But if by Baptisin you bring them within the Church, and intitle them to Covenanted Grace and Mercy, through Christ their Saviour, ye make fure Work in God's Way. Whereas to leave them without, is to ramble in a Wilderness of Mazes and Uncertainties, by the bare Light of Natural Reason; which is nothing but to make random Work, and put all to hazards, because there is no Promise.

The only pretended Proof for the Salvation of unbaptized Infants, I could yet find in the Baptists Writings, is in Mark x. 14. Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. This is faid by Christ of unbaptized Infants, for such are those he spoke of, says Mr. Gale, Let. 11. 421. But, alas! how precarious and impertinent is this Allegation?

1. It

1. It is precarious; for now does he know those Infants were unbaptized? Does the facred Text give him this Information? Or does its Silence prove it, because the Scripture must be understood to deny what it does not record? If this proves his Point, we can, by the fame Medium, prove Persons to be baptized by St. Paul, or his Order, without any previous Profession of Faith and Repentance, and without hearing a Syllable of the Gospel preached. And the Instance is in Lydia's Houshold, Ads xvi. 14, 15. She herself heard and believed; but neither of the Two is noted of her Family that were at the fame Time baptized. And by that Medium, we can also prove, that none of the Apostles were baptized in Christ's Time, because it is not recorded in the Gospel. Indeed, throughout the whole Course of his Ministration on Earth, there is not a single Person nominated that was baptized. Only we read in general, that his Disciples baptized; and, as we suppose, not without his Order. But how, whom, where, when, and in that precise Age, we are not told. So that, for ought we know, those Infants might be baptized, as well as other Disciples. For we have as much Evidence for their Baptism, as for that of the Adult.

2. It is impertinent; because those Infants, if Males, were certainly circumcifed, unless he can prove them to be less than Eight Days old, which is highly improbable. Their Parents were not of a Heathenish Extract and Profession; for the Childrens Bread was not to be given unto Dogs. Jews those Persons were that brought them unto Christ. A good Opinion they had of Jesus, if they did not also believe him to be the Messias; therefore they besought his Prayer and Blessing for the little Children. What then if those Insants were not baptized? Were they not certainly within the Covenant and Church of God? And this, if Males, by the Right of Circum-

cumcision, which was then the Initiatory Ordinance still in Force, and serving for the Ends that Baptisin did in Times ensuing? Whereby, I think, Baptism, in that Juncture, was not so necessary a Rite to make Disciples, as afterwards, when Circumcision was removed.

What Reason, now, is there to put unbaptized Infants and the Children of Heathens, to stand on the same Bottom with those of circumcised Jews, who where then God's true Church and peculiar People? Strange confounding Work, to lay Jews and Gentiles, circumcised and uncircumcised, baptized and unbaptized, on the same Foot and Level! When Christ says, Salvation was of the Jews did it now all on a sudden become equally common to them, and to uncircumcised, or unbaptized Gentiles? No wonder if some People can be most consident and assured of Victory, when they think such Arguments as these will pass Muster, and carry the

Day.

But if, in our Adversaries Judgment, Salvation is fure to dying Infants, and God will receive them into the Church Triumphant, will he refuse to receive them into the Church Militant? Are they qualified for the one, while they be unqualified for the other? Or fit Members for the Kingdom of Glory, when they are unfit to be Members of the Kingdom of Grace? And will God admit them into eternal Communion with himself and his Saints in Heaven, but not admit them into Communion on Earth? The former is abundantly the greatest Blessing, and the God who frankly gives them that, will not grudge to give them the other, that is least. A large Step it is from the Church, to Heaven, but a larger still from the unbaptized and unchristened World. His ordinary way of Promotion is, to bring his People to the Means, and then to the End; or to add them to the Church, that they may be faved:

faved. But in the Case of Infants, all, it seems, must be extraordinary and beside the Rules. Yet the Church on Earth and that in Heaven are but one, shough differing in Condition. Since, therefore, he makes Infants Members of it when they die, it is no overbold Adventure, if we imitate his Goodness, and make them Members of it while they live. For, can he disallow the Method we take, when we do but follow his own Gracious Precedent? Or when we do but what he himself does in a far more eminent Degree and Manner? Yea, and what his Church always did from Abraham to Christ, by his own express Command and Order?

Yet shall I not dismiss that Paragraph of our Author, without remarking the notable Similitude he uses to clear off *John* iii. 5: "The Angels shall enter into the Kingdom of Glory, tho not baptized with Water; and we may reasonably suppose, that unbaptized Infants shall do the same: And so the

" Text refers to neither of them."

The Supposition is as reasonable, as the Expression is exact. Angels shall enter into a Kingdom in which they now are, and from which they were never excluded. And this I suppose is good Sense, or Sound Doctrine. But Christ speaks there of human Persons born of the Flesh, that was originally corrupted by the Fall; and stood, therefore, in need of a new Birth for their Restauration. And to confront the Argument, we are now put in Mind of glorious Spirits, who need no Regeneration, because they never finned. Where then is the Parallel? If Mankind shall inherit Glory on the same Foot with the Holy Angels, away with Scripture, Sacraments, Redemption, Grace, Chrift, and the whole Oeconomy of our Religion, as needless and superfluous. when our Author drew this wild Comparison, he thought Padobaptists were all so fast asleep, that they would never look into his Reflections. But

But farther; "If there be any Mercy in God" who is Goodness itself, then all Infants, who could never offend him, shall assuredly be faved." This is no Oracle from God's Mouth, but from Mr. Gale's Breast; who builds on the natural Notices and Conceptions he has of God. Could Infants never offend God in their first Parents? Is not this his own Pelagiani/m? Nay, has he not taken a large Stretch beyond the Inventors of that old Herefy, who held Baptism necessary for the Admission of Infants into Heaven? For, suppose Infants as innocent as the Holy Angels, yet as they were never created in Heaven, like those Blessed Spirits, how does he know that their bare Innocency will bring them into Heaven? Was not immortal Life in an earthly Paradife, all their Due by Promise? And what necesfary Connexion has that with Heaven? They who by Gift were Inhabitants of the one, could not with-out another Gift or Act of Grace, be Heirs of the other. And fince a Forfeiture was made of their First Tenure, the Second they can never have without the Intervention of a Mediator, and the Application of his Merits. God has abundant Mercy and Goodness, but he deals it out by Covenant on his own Terms, to a Generation of Lapfed Men, who can never claim it, and everlafting Glory by it, as their Birth-right. And we had better keep to his Methods in difpenfing Gospel Grace and eternal Salvation, than presume to guide and teach him by the Laws of Deism. Arbitrary he is in those Dispensations, and no farther bound than he has been pleased to ingage by free Promise. I, therefore, affirm nothing about the future State of Infants dying unbaptized, but ingenuously profess my perfect Ignorance. And so would our Antagonists do likewife, had they but the Modesty and Humility, that dares not be wife beyond what is written. Were this Rule observed, they would supend their Judgment:

ment; and we should meet with fewer Dogmatizers in the Christian World.

When we urge the Necessity of baptizing Infants. that they may be freed from Original Sin, and infur'd of Salvation, the Question is commonly put unto us, Do you think that all Infants dying unbaptized, are damned? And that no Persons can be faved, that are not visibly in the Church? To such Questionists, I return St. Paul's Words in Answer; What have we to do to judge them that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth, I Cor. v. 12, 13. To his Tribunal, therefore, we wholly leave them to be disposed of as he pleases. It is not what we, or others think, that is our Rule, but what he has revealed in his Word; and we go not a Step farther in pasfing Judgment on Aliens from the Commonwealth of Ifrael, and Strangers to the Covenant of Promife, than he has warranted in the Scripture. Of those that are within the Church, we judge according to his Rules; by which we are all bound to act. For fecret. Things belong to God; but those Things which are revealed, belong to us, and to our Children for Ever, that we may do all the Words of his Law. Deut. xxxix. 29.

Concerning Infants dying unbaptized, 'tis none of our Business to prove their Damnation; but they that leave us in the Dark, and them in the miserable State of Nature, must from God's Word prove their Salvation. A Covenant Affurance we want in their Behalf, and not human Conjectures and Surmises. For, most certainly, in Adam, they all are under the Sentence of Death, 'till in Christ they be made alive. And if God be pleased to save them unbaptized, no Thanks to those who leave them where they were by Adam's Sin, without Help or Remedy, and will not bring them unto Chrift, nor graft them in his Body for Salvation.

God

God has bound us to his Laws and Ordinances, which we must always keep to when we can; but he has not absolutely bound himself. He may

therefore dispense where We cannot.

Declare the Baptists do, "That Original Guilt" deserves Damnation, and has justly subjected all the natural Off-spring of Adam to all Miseries, "Spiritual, Temporal and Eternal." Is it not then just in God to instict upon them what they all deserve? Or, may he not justly keep them in those Miseries, wherein he justly placed them at the first? Nay, I am persuaded, he cannot, with a Salvo to his Justice and Mercy, so much as threaten, what with the same Salvo he cannot execute. Let our Adversaries therefore look to the necessary Consequences of their own Doctrine; they are as much concerned as we.

For God, antecedently to his own Decrees and free Promises, was not obliged to redeem our Lapsed Race by the Death of Christ; nor is he obliged to apply the Merits of his Death to any, but on his own prescribed Terms and Conditions; which is, through the Fault of Men, they be neglected, their Blood will be imputed to themselves. When they are out of the Church and ordinary Methods of Salvation, they stand purely to prerogative Grace, and uncovenanted Mercy; and how far that will extend to their Relief, there is no one knows but Godhimself. From God's Revealed Will, his holy Word, Salvation can never be proved to be their Lot. Then the Rule holds good to us; Idem est non esse, whereas ours is a certain and safe Way, because it relies upon Promise and Covenant Insurance.

If God's Ordinances and appointed Means of Salvation be despised or neglected, there is a Penalty attending the Neglect; tho', perhaps, it may not be always inflicted to the utmost Extent that rigid

Law and Justice require. The Male-Child uncircumcifed at eight Days old, had broken the Covenant, and lay obnoxious to Excision. Adam must abstain from the Tree of Knowledge, and eat of that of Life, if he purposed to preserve his Immortality. bitten Fews refused to direct their Eyes to the brazen Serpent on the Pole, they had inevitably died of their Plagues. Naaman had still kept his Leprofy, had he not at last submitted to wash in Fordan. The Blind Man must have so continued, if he had disdained the Clay and Spittle which our Saviour's Hand had made medicinal for his Cure. I need add no more; but the Refult is, That our own and Childrens Souls are fafe enough in God's Hands; but upon Condition we observe his Ways and Ordinances.

So this Argument from Original Sin for Infant Baptisin, goes on these Grounds; That Infants lost the Favour of God, and their Right to immortal Life, by Adam's Transgression: In which Privileges there is no Possibility for them to be re-instated, but by the Redemption of Christ Jesus. That they can never injoy the Benefits of his Redemption, unless they have such a Union and Fellowship with him, as belongs to the Members of his Body. But that Fellowship and Union cannot ordinarily be obtained but by the Baptisin of Water, and never without that of the Holy Ghost. Whence it follows, that they should be baptized.

II. My next Argument for Infant-Baptism, shall be raised from a Passage related by the Three Evangelists; Matt. xix. 13, &c. Mark x. 13, &c. Luke xviii. 15, &c. In them we read, that little Children, who by St. Luke are called Infants, were brought to Christ to receive his Blessing by Prayer and Imposition of his Hands. Some of his Disciples, more officious then discreet, interposed to hinder it with Rebukes. At which Christ was much displea-

fed,

fed, and commanded, faying, Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of fuch is the Kingdom of God, or the Kingdom of Heaven. And he took them up in his Arms, put his Hands upon them, and blessed them. Also he proposed them as Patterns to other Persons for Entrance and Admission into the Kingdom of God.

This is the Account: But if we should mind Mr. Gale's Censures, we should never be so hardy as to alledge it in behalf of Infant-Baptism hereafter. " For (fays he, with his usual Modesty) what is " there, I beseech you, in the whole Matter, which " can make our Adversaries fasten on this Place? " It can only be the Mention of Children: And they " might as well have cited all the Passages in Scripture " where Children are named." Not so well, I can assure him, for Circumstances are very different. Afterwards fays he, in the next Page, which is Let. XI. p. 431. "Dr. Hammond himself reckons this among the more imperfect ways of Proving the "Point. But Dr. Whithy is pleased to improve the "Passage to the utmost Advantage;" (though what Advantage for his Design he could give to many other Places of Scripture where Children are named, I cannot fee) "and he being in general fo very fair " and fincere a Writer, and comprehending the " whole Substance of what can be urged from the " Place, I will examine what he has faid." And yet the Doctor, for all his Fairness, and usual Solidity, as Mr. Gale says of him elsewhere, does by-and-by but directly beg the Question, p. 433. And indeed nothing at all could be urged from the Place beside Imprudence and Impertinency, if what our Author had faid just before, was true. But leaving his Cen-fures and Examination for the present, I shall make these Remarks on the foresaid Passages of the Evangelists.

1. The Action of coming to Christ does frequently signify, according as it is circumstanced, the coming unto him as a Disciple. So it means, Matt. xi. 28. John iii. 26. and v. 40. and vi. 35, 44, 65. and vii. 37. Also to come unto God, is to come as a Worshipper and Believer, Heb. vii. 25. and xi. 6. And in the same Sense it is likewise used in the Old Testament, as fer. ii. 31. Ezek. xxxiii. 31. The Word Proselyte is derived from a Greek Verb, that signifies, to come unto. And hence a Scholar, or Disciple, was called outning, from outdo, to come unto

or frequent one's School.

We have Reason to think Christ means the same thing here by the Expression, when he says, Suffer little Children to come unto me. For he received and embraced them as his own, or as those to whom he bore a particular Love and Regard, and that peculiarly belonged unto him; and he bleffed them also, which certainly imported a Spiritual Bleffing, that appropriated them to himself, as the Children of Grace that were within the Church and Covenant. Also he declares. That of fuch as them was the Kingdom of Heaven: Which could never be true of them, unless they were his Disciples, and ingrafted in his Body: For, by the Scripture Account, no others go to Heaven. Regenerated they must be in order to that, and a Spiritual Relation they must have to Christ. And if Mr. Gale denies this, he destroys the Necessity of Christ's Redemption, and of our Spiritual Union with him, and, consequently, the whole Gospel Occonomy. If it seems strange to fay, that Infants are Christ's Disciples, I hope to prove undeniably in its proper place, that they may be so, and are so called in the New Testament. Yea, upon Grounds already laid down, if those hold good, they must be so in one Sense or other, before they can go to Heaven. But to give more Light and Strength to what is here advanced; 2. Writers

2. Writers in the primitive Times understood this Passage and Expression of coming to Christ, to signify coming as his Disciples, or to be made so by Baptisin. Dr. Whithy quotes some of them upon Matt. xix. 13, 14. of which Mr. Gale takes no Notice. Even Tertulian himself, Lib. de Baptist. Chap. xviii. allows this to be the Sense, though he was fingular in his Opinion about the Baptism of Infants; as he was also about that of Batchelors and Virgins, Widowers and Widows of all Ages, 'till they were either married, or confirmed in Continency. For the Objection made against him in behalf of baptizing Infants, Suffer little Children to come unto me, he freely passes in that Sense, without Contradiction, but only endeavours to put it by; Veniant dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, &c. Let them come to be baptized when they grow up, let them come when they learn. And feeing he allowed that to be the Sense, he did but apparently argue against Christ, and in that Case prefer his Judgment before his Saviour's, when he would have little Children detained from Baptism 'till they grew up to know Christ; while Christ himself was for their coming to him in their present Infant State; i.e. for their being then baptized, as Tertullian took the Phrase.

3. If in this Sense the Words should be understood, then here is a general Command for bringing Infants to Christ, or suffering them to be brought, and so to come, that they may receive his Blessing, and be baptized as his Disciples and Heirs of his Kingdom. For the Command is indefinite and universal; without Limitation of Time, or Restriction of Privilege to the present Children. No Personal Favour or Affection was it to them alone who were then on the Spot of Action: But it is communicated to all others that should be brought to him, as they were. Little Children that so come, must

be permitted to come without Inhibition, under Pain

of his Displeasure.

When I fay, it was no Personal Favour and Affection them more than others, I mean it of others that are in their Quality and Condition. But diftinguished they must be from the Children of Infidels, who are out of the Covenant, and will not be brought to Christ by the unbelieving Parents: Tho if others have them in their Power, and bring them to him, the Church refuses not to baptize them upon the Faith of the Undertakers who present them, and ingage for their Christian Education; and who, upon those Accounts, become their Ghostly Fathers, or Spiritual Parents. But the Affection and Treatment Christ shewed to those Infants, sprang from their being the Children of God's People, and within his Church and Covenant. And this Reason holds for the Children of Christian Parents to the World's End. In those Respects they were God's Disciples, Isa. viii. 16. And no wonder if Christ Embraced and Blessed them as his own. And if baptized they were not at that Time, there was no need they should be; because that as the Christian Church was not then founded on our Saviour's Death, nor fo clearly distinguished from the Fewish; fo Circumcifion was not abolished, nor Baptism made the Initiatory Ordinance to all Nations in its stead.

4. The Command being general and unlimitted in respect of Times, and all Infants ordered to come unto Christ that should be brought, they can come to him no otherwise but by Baptism ever since he is gone to Heaven. By Prayers the Infants of Christians may be recommended to him, and so may those of Heathens too. But here is no local Motion, nor Personal Approach of Disciples, which Christ meaneth, as included in the Words. But when they are brought to his saving Ordinance, and presented to him in the Congregation, where he has ingaged him.

felf

felf to be; this is a proper coming unto Christ, and a Union with him by Church Membership. For they are then joined to him as their Head, by the Mediation of his Spirit in that Sacrament. The only way therefore, that they can now come unto Christ, let them come, or let them be brought; else we may incur his Displeasure, by our Prohibitions. For if we refuse to dedicate and devote them to him after the only manner that is now left us to do it in, we hinder their coming, and do them Wrong. Ready he is to receive, embrace and bless them, and it is not for us to keep them off, and put a Bar and Obstacle to his Grace.

5. The Bleffing Christ imparted to those Infants, was of a Spiritual Nature, relating to the Interest of their Souls. For he considered them as the Holy Seed that were incorporated in his Church, and for this Reason they were the special Objects of his Love and Blessing. If therefore, the Blessing he gave them was spiritual, the Communion of Grace they had with him, whereof Circumcision was then the Seal. For the same Grace and Blessing, the Infants of Christian Parents must still come unto him, according to his general Command; whereof they receive the Seal in Baptisin. For we need not doubt but treat them he will, as those were treated, fince his Affection to them is the same; since they are by Descent in the same Quality with them, and do come within the Limits of his Command. That he fo confidered, and fo bleffed those Children, I gather from these Reasons:

1. What those that brought them desired and expected for those Infants, the Gospel says, was to pray for them, and touch them. Their Design he approved of, and therefore he answered their Expectation. Imposition of his Hands, answered to their desire of having them touched, and his Blessing to Prayer. Christ never used Prayer in healing the

1 3

Sick. That would have derogated from his Divine Power, as if he wrought his Miracles in such a precarious and dependent manner, as his Disciples did. And to impart a Blessing by laying on of Hands, was a Form in use as long ago as Jacob's Time, Gen.

xlviii. 14, 17.

2. If he considered them only in the State of Nature, and imparted to them but a Temporal Blessing, it had been foreign to his Purpose, to talk of the Kingdom of Heaven, and to propose them as Patterns to such as would enter thither. For what Affinity is there between those Matters? If Heaven belonged to those Insants, in a Spiritual Estate they must be considered, and a Spiritual Blessing they must receive. For nothing else qualified them for it, and could promote their eternal Happiness. And in no other respects could they be Patterns to those that should go to Heaven. To heal their Bodies, and bless them in Civil or Temporal Matters, had no Relation to that Affair.

3. Nothing can be assign'd to which his Blessing truly and properly related, unless it was Spiritual. Mr. Gale expresses himself cautiously, when he says; " It is probable enough the Children were brought " to Christ to be healed by him, since it was the " Lord's Custom frequently to heal by laying on "his Hands." p. 431. And so it might be in other Matters. But his Caution forsook him, when he presently adds; "Though 'tis only said, They brought them to have his Hands laid upon them." For St. Matthew fays, They brought them also that he should pray. But Mr. Keach knowing that Probabilities were flender Proofs, had more Spirit and Vivacity, as they fay fome blind Creatures are most bold, and roundly afferts, "No doubt those Children were brought to Christ to be healed of some " bodily Distemper. And again, Our Saviour was "then healing the Sick," And yet the Three E-

vangelists that relate the Passage, say, He was not then healing the Sick, but preaching the Gospel. Judge now what is to be thought of such Men. But

I cannot subscribe to their Opinion. For,

1. It is no where intimated in the Three Gospels, that those Infants were Sick. 2. Christ never prayed in healing the Sick, yet Prayer they desired who brought them to Christ. 3. It is not likely the charitable Disciples would have rebuked them, had this been the Case; when they used rather to intercede with him in behalf of such Miserable Objects for their Cure, Matt. xv. 23. And, 4. Never in the Gospel is his healing of the Sick, called, A blessing of them; nor did he use to imbrace, or take them up in his Arms for that Purpose.

Since therefore no Civil or Temporal Bleffing can with Reason be specified, as communicated by Christ in that Bleffing; it remains, that it must be Spiritual. And certainly it was not fruitless and ineffectual, but operated according to his Intent. And the like Bleffing he has in Reserve for our Infants, for which we do bring and present them to him in

his Church.

6. Of those Infants it is not only declared, that of such is the Kingdom of God; but also they are made Exemplars of Innocence to every one that will be a true Member of God's Church, and go to Heaven. I do not think they are here made Emblems of the single Vertue of Humility; but that was at another Time, and on a particular Occasion, to check the Ambition of his Disciples, Matt. xviii. 4. But those Infants having received the Grace of Circumcision, and presently after our Saviour's Blessing, are proposed as Patterns of Innocency in general to all God's People. For every one that will indeed enter the Church of God, and thereby hope for Salvation, must, in his Temper and Disposition, be such a worthy Member of it, as those Infants

were. This I take to be our Lord's Meaning; as take Mr. Gale's Reason to the contrary, to be insufficient.

"For though he grants, that the Kingdom of Heaven does almost universally through the " whole Gospel mean the Dispensation of the Messias, yet it cannot mean so here; because in St. Mark " x. 15. our Lord says; Whosoever shall not receive " the Kingdom of God as a little Child, he Shall not enter therein; i. e. into Glory; for into the " Church the greatest Villains may be admitted, " if they conceal their Wickedness; so that he must " mean they shall not enter into his Glorious King-" dom." They may enter indeed with their Bodies, but not with their Souls; or be Members of the Church in the fight of Men, but not so in the fight of God. This they can in no wife be, as St. Luke's Words are, while they are concealed Villains. When our Lord proposed those Innocent Members for their Examples, what had he to do but to let them know, what would make them true Members of the Kingdom of Grace, that they might come thereby to the Kingdom of Glory? For the one is necessarily preparative to the other. His Business was to instruct them in their Duty on Earth, that they might go to Heaven. Subjects of the Kingdom of Grace he set before them, to let them know, what fort of Subjects they must be of the same Kingdom. if thereby they expected any real Advantage. This might very well be Christ's Meaning; especially since those Two Kingdoms in the Main are but One.

St. Luke's Words are strong and home; shall in no wife enter therein, Chap. xviii. 17. But no stronger than the same Expression is to our purpose, Rev. xxi. 27. And there shall in no wife enter into it any thing that desileth, neither what soever worketh Abomination, or maketh a Lie. Such Sinners shall in the wife enter into the Holy City, the New Ferusalem;

\$ Dag

that came down from God out of Heaven, ver. 2. By virtue whereof the Tabernacle of God is with Men. ver. 3. Which again is called, That great City, the New Ferusalem, descending out of Heaven from God, ver. 10. In the Light whereof the Nations of them which are faved do walk; and the Kings of the Earth, and the Nations do bring their Glory and Honour into it, ver. 24, 26. Which Descriptions do necessarily determine it to be the Church of Christ on Earth, or the Kingdom of Grace, not the Kingdom of Glory. For this last Kingdom will never descend and come down from Heaven to Men; but they will afcend, or be conveyed up into it. Nor will Kings and Nations carry their Glory and Honour thither, but leave it all behind, as it is Civil or Temporal; and receive another Glory there, that is Spiritual and Eternal. This Sense is clearly evinced by Grotius in his Annotations on that Chapter; and it justifies the Interpretation I have given to our Saviour's Words, in Opposition to Mr. Gale. And so those Infants might belong to the Dispensation of the Messias, and to the Kingdom of Grace, or be Members of Christ's Church, notwithstanding Mr. Gale's Exception.

What follows in Mr. Gale of Infants being admitted on this Ground to the Lord's Supper, as well as to Baptisin, has been spoken to before, and thi-

ther I refer him.

Such Objections as are made against us to this effect; "If those Infants were brought to be bapti"zed, why did the Disciples rebuke them for it?
"Why did not Christ order them to be baptized?
"And why did he not thereby prevent our Errors,
"when one Word from his Mouth would have done
"it?" I say, of these and the like Objections, that
their Force is enervated by this one Consideration;
Circumcision did to them supply all the Ends of
Bap-

Baptisin. More might be said, but this, when duly

confidered, is enough.

Let Mr. Gale lay all together, and see whether we might as well urge any Place of Scripture where Children are named, for our purpose, as this before us. Whatever Dr. Whithy has done, I am not so vain as to think that I my self have managed this, or indeed any other Argument, to the best Advantage. But Mr. Gale must sometimes magnify his Adversaries, to magnify his own Victory; or rather indeed to apprize the World of the deplorable Badness of our Cause, since its best Champions can say no more for it, and he can so easily bassle them.

Having mentioned Tertullian, I shall step a little aside, to see how, in Mr. Gale's Account, it sares with that African Father. Three things are said of him; I. That he strenuously opposed Insant Baptism as unlawful. 2. That his Opposition of it is no Argument that it was practised in his Time. 3. That he has some Passages in him which are incon-

fistent with that Baptism.

I. Tertullian strenuously opposed Infant-Baptism; Let. XIII. p. 528. as a Thing that ought not to be done, p. 540. nor administred to them: He makes it therefore useless and unlawful to baptize Infants; but does not intimate so of unmarried Persons; only he advises such as are in danger of siming, to delay their being baptized. To know if this be a fair Representation of Tertullian's Mind, we must have recourse to his own Words. They are in that famous Place I have already cited, which I shall translate into English as exactly as I am able. Thus, therefore, says he.

"According to every body's Condition or Disposition, and Age also, the Delay of Baptism is more profitable; especially in the Case of little Children. For what necessity is there to run the Sponsors (or

Sureties, into Danger? Because both they by Morta-

lity

lity may fail in their Promises, and be deceived by the Increase of a bad Temper. The Lord in-"deed faith; Forbid them not to come unto me. Let them come therefore when they grow up, let them 66 come when they learn, whither it is they come. Let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. Wherefore should that Innocent Age hasten to the Remission of Sins? More Caution is used in Secular Matters, so that an earthly Sub-stance, or Inheritance, is not there intrusted, where the Divine is. Let them know to feek or ask Salvation, that you may feem to give it to one that seeketh. Non minore de causa innupti quoque procrastinandi, &c. For no less Cause are the Unmarried to be deferred (from Baptism) in whom Temptation is ready as well in Virginity by Ripeness of Years, as in Widower-ship by " Vacation, till they either marry, or are confirmed in Continency. If any understand the Weight " of Baptism, they will rather fear the Obtaining of it, than the Delay. Faith is intire, and fure of Salvation.

This is the Passage at large, and not a Word spoken in it of the Sin and Unlawfulness of baptizing little Children; but only of the No-Necessity of it, and of the Hazards and Inexpediency of it to them. and the Sponfors. And does Mr. Gale know no Difference between unnecessary and unlawful? Or between Danger and Unfitness, and Sin and Guilt? If People may not be in Danger without Sin, there is no living in this World. Infants had not actual Sins, therefore he thought it needless to baptize them for that Reason; and so it was to have them remitted for the present. They knew not the Lord, nor the Ends and Weight of Baptism; therefore he judged it improper to baptize them; and for all this it might not be unlawful in his Opinion. And whatever he fays or thought, the fame might as well have have been urged against the Circumcision of Infants.

But be his Reasons ever so strong against the baptizing of little Children in their Intancy, he fays still, there was no less Cause to defer the baptizing of unmarried Persons, till they were confirmed in Continency. If he uses not all the same Topics here as there, his Judgment was nevertheless the fame. Or if the Inexpediency was not so high inone Case as in the other, yet there needs be no Un-lawfulness in either. Wherefore, if his Judgment was wrong about the Unmarried, as the Antipadobaptists must consess, it might be wrong about Infants also. This weakens his Authority. This is Mr. Gale's way of arguing, to weaken the Father's Authority; and we are to regard him no farther than his Reafons compel.

Here is One or Two of that Father's Singularities, for which he is commonly noted by Learned Men and the Christian World. And I take it to be his natural Rigor that betrayed him into such Exceffes, and induced him, by Anticipation, to favour too inuch of the Novatian Principles, who made Sin irremissible after Baptisin. Whereas the Apostles used no such Precaution, but baptized Thoufands together upon the First Profession of Faith in the Adult, without any Dread or Apprehensions of

future Dangers, that were too possible.

2. "Had Infant-Baptism, says Mr. Gale, been the fettled Practice and Judgment of the Church, " and what they thought was supported by the Authority and Tradition of the Apostles, &c. It can't be imagined, that Tertullian should venture to oppose it; or if he did, that he should imploy no more pains to excuse what seemed to contradict the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles and " the Whole Church, p. 510, 511. But the Oppofition he made, argues only, that some in his Time " many other wild Notions did endeavour to in"troduce it, &c."

But may it not as well be faid, That Tertullian's arguing against baptizing unmarried Persons, does not imply that unmarried Persons were then commonly baptized, but only that some endeavoured in his Time to introduce it among many other wild Notions; and that if he had known the Church practised it, and thought they had the Apostles Warrant to support their Practice, he had not ventured to oppose it; or if he had, he would have taken more pains to excuse himself, and pleaded more strenuously for his Contradiction to the Apostles and the whole Church? And yet how came he to plead against Christ, and make Infant-Baptisin unlawful, as we are now told, when he understood Christ's Words and Command, Suffer little Children, &c. to concern that Baptism? Or what more pains need he take, than to prove a Thing unlawful, in order to cry it down? Did he not know St. Paul's Doctrine, that if a Widow marry, she is no Adultress, Rom. vii. 3. and that fo to marry was no uncommon Practice in the Church? How then came he to condemn Second Marriages, as a Species stupri? Lib. De Exhort. Castit. c. 9. And how also came Nazianzen to give his Advice for the Delay of Infant-Baptisin, when Mr. Gale cannot deny but it was than fettled and common in the Church; and they thought they had Scripture Authority to support it? Let who will justify Tertullian's Conduct, it is easy to see the Weakness of Mr. Gale's Pleas.

2. Out of the same Father he cites some Passages, which annex those Conditions to Baptisin and haptized Persons, that are not practicable in an Infant State; and from thence concludes, that Tertullian could never allow of Infant-Baptism. And this, as I observed before, is his Method with other ancient Writers. But he needed not have

romaged about for such Testimonies and Authorities. He may find good store of the same kind in the Books of Padobaptists both Antient and Modern. Will he thence infer they do not commonly practise

Padobaptism?

Indeed we scarce ever Write or Preach about Baptism, but we express what Conditions are requisite for it in the Suscipients, and what Obligations baptized Persons are under to Faith and Obedience. But we understand them as binding the Adult to present Performance, and Infants to future. Our very Church Catechism says, Faith and Repentance are required in Persons to be baptized. How perverse would it be to conclude from hence, that the Church of England admits no Infants unto Baptism, because they have not those Conditions? Yet no better Construction do some Antipadobaptists put upon her Words. And fince we know they egregiously pervert her Sense in this, we do not wonder they deal fo with the Scriptures and the Fathers. Among the Fews it was required in Circumcifed Persons, that they should love the Lord their God with all their Hearts and Souls, and keep his Laws: And our Adverfaries contend that Circumcifion obliged them to keep the whole Law of Moses. Were not Infants then daily circumcifed, because they could not so love the Lord, and keep his Laws?

Between Mr. Gale and his Antagoniss it is farther disputed, whether Tertullian held such a Necessity of Baptisin for Salvation, as included Infants; so that they must be baptized for that end, or else be counted lost by his Dostrine. I am persuaded this Necessity might be made appear from his Words, Lib. De Animâ, Chap. xxxix. 40. But I need not

interfere in that Controversy:

III. St. Peter exhorts the fews that were on the Point of Conversion; Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Fesus Christ, for the Re-

mission

mission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost; For the Promise is to you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call, Acts ii. 38, 39. For Two Ends were those Jews to be baptized upon their Conversion: One End was to have their Sins forgiven, and this takes off the Guilt and Punishment. The other was to receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost. Infants being tainted with Original Guilt, stood in need of Pardon, and being defiled with its Stain, they needed the Sanctification of God's Spirit. For these Ends therefore Baptism was useful to them, as well as their Parents.

Both these Ends and Reasons of Baptism were common to the Parents and Children together. And one, if not both, the Apostle expresty says, was fo: For the Promise is to you, and to your Children. Which Promise must relate to the Gift of the Holy Ghost at least, and I think it may include the Remission of Sins, by reason these Two are concomitant: He that is fanctified, is also justified; and he that is justified, must in some measure be sanctified. But be it that the Promise relates only to one of the Ends, this is still sufficient to ground the Argument fince it extends to the Children as well as the Parents. For where the Reason is common to both, so must be the Privilege and the Practice. But the End or Reason why the Parents were to be baptized, was, to receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost. Of this Holy Ghoft the Children had the Promise as well as they; therefore must they be baptized that they might receive the Promised Gift. Or thus; To the Benefit of Baptism, which is Remission of Sins, or at least the Gift of the Holy Ghost, the Children had an equal Right with their Parents and, consequently, they must have an equal Right to Baptisin. For he that has a Right to the End, or Benefit, has a Right to

the Means whereby it is attained; and if he has not this Right, he had as good be without the other.

Very much additional Strength this Argument will receive, when we confider who the Persons were to to whom the Apostle addresses himself in those Words. For Jews they were, who by the Laws of God and the constant Practice of their Church from Abraham's Time to that very Hour, injoyed the Privilege of having their Infants admitted into the Church and Covenant; as likewise did the Proselytes to them from the Gentiles. What then could People, who had those Laws and that Usage so deeply riveted in their Minds, understand by St. Peter's Words, (which, in respect of Baptism and its Benefits, set them and their Children on even Ground) but that they were still equally to injoy their ancient Privileges without Retrenchment? For his Address is unlimitted; Be baptized every one of you, Men, Women and Children, for a Reason that is common to you all; the Promise of the Holy Ghost being made to you and your Children, and the Benefits of Baptism lying open to you and them, as those of Circumcision did. In what other Sense than this could the Fews understand him? Would the Apostle then have talked after this unguarded manner in his divine Instructions, to People whose Tempers he knew to be wonderful tenacious of their old Rights and Customs, if of those Rights their Children were now abridg'd? Had this been the Case, an Address so exactly formed after the old. Fashion, and suited to their Laws, Usages and Humours, had tended directly to cast them and the Church of Christ into a Snare, and to establish Error by a Rule, if my Judgment fails me not. Nor can it be supposed those obstinate Fews had been so very quiet, if they had feen their Children now to lose their ancient Rights, and be quite disprivileged, in case they had understood the Apostle otherwise.

Dr. Whithy is pleased freely to give up this Place to the Baptists, "Because, as he tays, they are the " miraculous Gifts of the Holy Ghost that are here meant, which Infants cannot have." But I am not yet inclined to refign to his Judgment in this Matter. For St. Peter makes the Gift he speaks of common to all Christians throughout the Worlds and even to the World's End; inasimuch as it belongs to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. So the Gift is universal. extending to Christians in all Places and in all Times; and this cannot be true of Miraculous Gifts, which feveral Christians were without in the Apostolical Age itself, as the Doctor acknowledges, and which continued not for many Ages following, but gradually decreased, till at last they quite expired. What Necessity is there to understand the Place of Miraculous Gifts alone? Might not the Apostle under them comprehend those that were ordinary? And must he not do so, if his Words were verified? He spoke indeed of extraordinary Gifts before, but his Discourse received some Pause and Interruption by the Interlocution of the Jews; upon which he reassum'd it, to give a proper Answer to their Question. Then might he accommodate his Discourse to inform them of the ordinary Effects of Baptism, which would last so long as the World did.

Besides, it is not likely he should ingage to make them all equal with the Apostles, and other most eminent Disciples, in Spiritual Gifts. Or if he had, it was not answered in the Event. And this might have shocked their Faith, and lessened his Authority. For, when the Holy Ghost fell in an extraordinary manner on new Converts, we find it commonly noted in the Sacred History. But no such Thing is noted of those 3000 converted Jews after Baptisin, nor is it scarce credible of them all. But, as it were, in Contra-distinction to them, it is recorded of the Aposses, that many Wonders and Signs were done by them, ver. 43. Why were the late Converts omitted, if they had the like Gift of doing Wonders? Or if some very few of them might have the Gift, that was no general Incouragement to be baptized, nor half an Accomplishment of the Aposses Words. For such Reasons as these I must beg leave to dissent

from the Doctor's Opinion. Weak and filly is this Objection of the Baptists: "The Promise is to all that are afar off, even as " many as the Lord our God shall call. But he can call only Adult Persons, who are capable of hear-" ing and obeying the Call, which Infants cannot "do. Therefore to the Adult alone belongs the "Promise, and they alone must be baptized."
Poor Stuff indeed, and very false! For cannot God call by his Acts and Ordinances, as well as by his Words? How else did he formerly call the Infants of Fews and Proselytes into his Covenant and the Society of his Church? He gave Command to bring them in, but the Infants themselves could neither hear nor obey; therefore others did it for them. Even so may he call the Infants of Christian Parents. But St. Peter's Meaning is none of our Adversaries. He tells the Fews there present; The Promise is to you, and to your Children. This comprehends them and their whole Progeny. Then he extends it farther to take in others; And not only to you who are here upon the Spot, and to your Off-spring after you; but even to all whom God shall call into his Church from remote Places, and in future Times, as he has done long before. They and their Children have the fame Promise and the same Privilege, the Children being called in the Parents, as was imported in the Covenant unto Abraham. makes it a Rule that is universal and perpetual.

"But it is farther urged, that by Children we must not understand Infants, but Posterity. For

" by

"by Children the Scripture usually means People of Age; as the Children of Ifrael, &c." I grant it, that we must not understand Infants alone, but they must still be included in the Account. For in such a Latitude as the Apostle there uses, there is no Posterity without Infants. So there were among the Children of Israel; and the same Sense we must give to the Expression here, by taking in the Parents with all their Children, or Posterity. Then it is the same as Seed in the Covenant, the Holy privileged Seed, whom the Parents Faith intituled to the Covenant and its Seal, by God's Act of Grace. And so this Sense is not at all to the Disadvantage of our Cause; unless we should deal with the Words, as Mr. Gale has dealt with the State of Infants in Irenaus.

This Holy Bishop in a Place that is much contested, teaching, that Christ came to fanctify and fave People of every Age, who by him are born anew unto God, distributes them into their several Classes or Periods of Time; Infants, Little ones, Boys, Youths and Seniors: Than which way of Reckoning nothing could be more accurate to confine Infants to the strictest and properest Senses Hereupon Mr. Gale, as I think, to shew his Talent in Critical Learning, more than any thing else, gives a Stretch of Ten Years Space at least unto Infancy, before the End of which Infants may believe, especially through the Help of Mr. Lock's Method of Education, and be baptized; and fo triumphs over his trifling Adversaries. If so, Infant-Baptism should come into good Repute again, and we ought to be no longer discriminated by the Name of Padobaptists and its Opposite.

But he that will understand Irenaus aright, must take Infancy in all its Parts, provided it must reach unto Ten Years space. For as he means, that there is no Part of the other Periods of human Life where-

K 2

in People may not be fanctified and faved by Regeneration in Christ; so neither is there any Part of that Period he allots to Infancy, in which they may not receive the same Benefits. Thus every Part of our Lise is provided with a Remedy against the fatal Essection of Redeeming Grace, and needs not abide under the Pollution of Sin, and the Sentence of Death. And thus that Father's Sense will be fully and truly represented, and his Period of Infancy run parallel with the rest, when, otherwise, it would be desective and unequal. But Mr. Gale takes the Liberty to subdivide upon him, and canton his first Period into Parcels, contrary to his Intention; and then to pick out that Part of it for his own Purpose which he likes best, tho' it cannot be Fair Dealing

with his Author, or his Readers.

Criticism, in itself, is a necessary and excellent Accomplishment for a Scholar; but as it is used by Mr. Gale, and many others, fometimes to cramp Words and Phrases into the Narrowest Limits, and fometimes to stretch them beyond all Measure, it crucifies Authors, or ferves them as Procrustes did his Strangers, and will fooner bring us into Sceptism; than settle our Faith and Right Notions of Things. Irenaus was a Plain Dealer and Honest Bishop, that took Words in their common Acceptation, and affected not to go out of the Road. lieve, therefore, he meant by Infants, little Children under Four Years Old, or thereabout, as the World does, and as Dr. Whithy from Eustathius and Phavorinus notes on Matt. xix. 13, 14. But he knew nothing of Mr. Lock and our English Laws, &c. Nor went to Hippocrates and some other Authors, for an odd and fingular Notion of the Word. But to let this pass, and return:

The Baptists lay hold on this Text; "And they "that gladly received his Word, were baptized; Acts

"ii.

" ii. 41. This feems to limit the Baptism to the "Adult, and exclude Infants who could not glad"Iy receive the Word." Yet is it not faid there, that none others beside them that so received the Word, were baptized; but they were, and others might be. However, this does not in the least affect the Apostle's Doctrine, nor destroy the Rule he hath fet the Church for extending the Privilege of Baptism to the Children or Posterity, including Infants, as well as to the Parents. This Rule will stand firm, though no Infants at all might be then and there baptized. For another Time would ferve to do it, after the Parents left the Assembly and were returned Home. Strangers at Ferufalem they mostly were, and brought not their Infants into that Assembly; and if none were present in the Place, ther could not be then baptized. And this we can prove by clearer Evidence than the Baptists do the the other.

For, if back we look into ver. 6, 7. there we read; The Multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every Man heard them speak in his own Language; and they were all amazed and marvelled, saying, Behold, &c. And ver. 12. They were all amazed, and were in doubt, saying one to another, What meaneth this? Here is the Note of Universality, All Twice used to express the whole Company that were then present. Now they that could all judge of different Languages, that could wonder, be amazed, consounded, and ask such Questions, were all old enough to receive the Word with Gladness. Better Authority this is to shew no Infants were then present, than the Baptists is to shew there were none then baptized.

But to such Difficulties as this, I believe, a more just and solid Solution may be given. History briefly reciting human Transactions, takes express Notice of those whom the Lawyers call Persona Civiles, or Persons who are in a Legal Capacity of acting for themselves. Minors and Persons of the like State and Quality it passes over in Silence, unless there be some special Reason to mention them. These are known to be comprehended under their respective Heads and Chiefs, who oblige them by their own Acts, and dispose of them and their Fortunes according to their own Discretion. So the short and general Narrative specifies the Heads. who, as the Principal Springs and Wheels in a Machine, carry away their Dependents along with them in their own Motion. It is common in our publick Discourses, to apply ourselves to Men, when we would be understood of Women and Children too, that have the Use of Reason. And so the Bap. tists themselves, in the Rules for the other Sacrament, will have Females comprized by the Figure Syllaplis under the Males. This Point must be further illustrated and justified in my next Argument. But according to this Account, and to the Custom of God's Church about Converts, the Profelytism and Baptism of little Children, comes in of Course, as an Accession to those of the Parents, and needs not be specified in the History.

An Instance for this may suffice at present; and it shall be in a Case of the same Nature with that which is now in Hand. In Esther viii. 17. we read, Many of the People of the Land became Jews; for the Fear of the Jews sell upon them. Then their Male Instants were circumcised, and the Females admitted Proselytes, as well as the Parents. For so was God's Law and the Church's Practice. Yet mind the only Motive that made the Proselytes. It was that of Fear, which could fall on none but Persons of Choice and Discernment to provide for their own Security, not on Instants. Shall we then limit the Proselytism and Circumcisson to Adult Persons, because they alone were capable of Fear,

the

the only Inducement that made the Converts, and debar Infants, because uncapable? Neither must we for the like Reason debar them from Proselytism and Baptism in St. Luke's Narrative. For those Infants could no more fear, than these could gladly receive the Word.

IV. If in the New-Testament Infants are called Christ's Disciples, then are they proper Subjects of his Baptism. But so are they called Ads xv. 10. Now therefore, why tempt ye God, to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples, which neither our Fathers nor we were able to bear? That these were Christ's Disciples, neither is nor can be denied. The Yoke defigned to be imposed on them, was Circumcifion, in the Fews Sense of a Bond obliging to keep the whole Mosaical Law in order to Salvation, as appears by comparing ver. 1, 5, 24. together. For they thought that Ordinance and the whole Law must continue in Force for ever. Every Male Disciple of Jesus Christ they conceived must be circumcifed, and thereby bound to keep the Law; and none but Disciples; for professed Infidels and their Children, had no Right. They themselves and their Children being circumcifed already, the Defign was level'd at the Gentile Converts, who then began to be numerous, and were daily increasing, whereof some must have Male Infants. These Infants therefore, those Zealots for the Law would have circumcifed ofter the Manner of Moses, ver. 1. and as their Law prescribed, Exod. xii. 48. and also as their Church had always practifed. For doubtless they would not break the Law and Custom by circumcifing the Fathers, and leaving their Infants uncircumcifed. And so they would bring upon them all, the Unsupportable Yoke of Circumcision to keep the Law, as was their Sense of the Matter. Consequently, if the Gentile Profelytes had any Male Infants, or were like to have to the World's End; and K 4 if if those Zealots for the Law were strong for circumcising all Male Proselytes, with their Male Infants, but none others, then must those Male Infants, of Necessity, be reckoned among Christ's Disciples; which was the Thing to be demonstrated. Then, if his Disciples they were, they must be actually baptized, or had a present Right to be, according to his Law for discipling all Nations, Matt. xxviii. 19. and according to the constant Practice of the Church in those Days, who never made a Disciple, but they baptized him immediately.

Against this Mr. Gale argues; "Infants cannot be meant nor comprehended there in the Word Dif"ciples, because the Brethren on whom the At"tempt was made, are said to be taught, ver. 1.
"that without being circumcifed, they could not be saved. This can't include Infants." Strange News indeed! As if the Circumcifed Fews of Old were not taught in a Body to love the Lord, and keep his Commandments; and yet they had circumcifed Infants among them. And if after the Manner of Moses they were taught to do it, that Manner is well known, that the Parents were taught to

circumcife their Infants.

But Mr. Gale goes on, Let. VIII. p. 295, 296. The Affair related only to those among the Gentiles who were turned to God, according to St. James's Determination. And sure, none will say, Insants can turn from a False Religion to God." Yes, we say they can, and most assuredly are turned, when their Parents, turning from their former Idolatries and Superstitions, bring their Children along with them to God, and devote them to his Service, unless they be very careless of their Salvation. So it was in the Conversions of old, when they that turned to the Jews, turned their Insants also, and devoted them to the true God by Circumcision, who were before devoted to Idols and Dæmons by Heathen.

thenish Rites; of which we have enough in Tertullian, Lib. de Anima, Chap. xxxix. These were proper Proselytisms, Turnings or Conversions of Infants unto God. As Subjects, removing from one State, and naturalized in another, naturalize their Infants together with themselves; and so both turn Subjects to the New State.

Mr. Gale proceeds with a Masculine Courage; " The whole Scope of the Place, the Injunctions of " that venerable Council of the Apostles, their Let-" ter, all the Circumstances, do very evidently conspire to shew their Consultation related not to Infants, but only to the Adult. Nay, St. Pe-" ter, in the Words immediately preceding the " Verse our Author cites, says of the Persons who " are the Subjects of the Dispute, that God had pu-"rified their Hearts by Faith; from whence tis "plain, the Persons he spoke of were actual Belie-" vers; and consequently, by Nabilov, in the follow-" ing Words, the Holy Ghoft intends only the Converts, exclusively of their Infants, if they had any." Having thus won the Field, he runs out against Prepossessions, Fallacies, &c. and appeals to the Country-man's Judgment for the true Meaning of the Word Disciple; which I believe will fail him here, upon a little Instruction to that Countryman, and do better Service against his Notion of Infancy in Irenaus.

But not too fast; we have a great deal yet to say for our selves, of which I shall give him the Heads, and promise to make them out, with Enlargments

and Confirmations, if called upon. For,

Profession of the Gospel Doctrine and Religion, as it frequently signifies in the New Testament? May not Infants be dedicated, or give up their Names, to that Profession by Baptism, as they did to the Worship of God by Circumcision? It was by that

Pro-

Profession the Hearts of the Gentile Converts were purified; and not by the fingle Act of believing alone, which, in some sense, the Devils have, Fam. ii. 19. Or, if the Grace and Habit of Faith be meant thereby, why may not Infants have that Grace, fince the Baptists allow that they may be, and sometimes are, regenerated by the Spirit? They have it not in the Act, but they have it in the Root and Principle, seeing the Spirit of God is the Principle, not only of Faith, but of all Graces what soever in Religion. Surely, the Operations of God's Spirit on their Souls in a New Birth, are not vain and idle, but leave some Impressions and Effects. So Infants have the Principle of Reason in them, though we see no more of its visible Effects for some Time, than we fee of the Grace of their Regeneration. In a Word, the Guilt of Original Sin being remitted, its Filth washed off, and they themselves dedicated to the Faith and Religion of Christ by the Ordinance of Baptism and its Grace, their Hearts are then purified by Faith, in the Two Senses here given.

2. And this Account is confirmed by the Words themselves which St. Peter uses: God has put no Difference between us and the converted Gentiles. purifying their Hearts by Faith. The Purification is wholly afcribed unto God. It was not then their actual Faith did it; for though that is principally the Act of God by Grace, yet it is the Act of Men also in which they co-operate. But the Gospel Religion, the Word of Faith, is the pure Gift of God, his fole Act of Grace, to which human Endeayours have contributed nothing. When therefore, God inclined the Gentiles Hearts to embrace the Faith and Religion of Christ, and to bring their Children with them from the Service of Idols, to the Service of God, he purified the Hearts of both by Faith, or by the Profession of the Gospel of Faith. And if this be the True Account of the Place, as I take take it to be, it removes the Main Rub and Difficulty out of our Way. For this is accommodated to

the State of Infants, as well as the Parents.

But Mr. Gale feems to question, whether those Gentile Converts had any Infants; for he says, If they had any, what their Numbers were at that precise Time, we need not enquire. But surely such Converts would have Infants before the World's End; and upon them all those Judaizing Christians intended to lay the Yoke of Circumcision and the Law of Moses, because they thought them for ever obligatory. So this makes no Alteration in the Case. The rest of the Objection is very weak, and will be

taken off with greater Ease. For,

3. Disciples are of Two Sorts, initial and incomplete, and those that are finished and more perfect. These last must have actual Faith and Obedience. in which Sense we do not pretend Infants can be Disciples. The others are so only by Profession, or at most by the Seeds and Principle of Grace in their New Birth, while they are separated from the profane World, and dedicated to the True Religion by God's Ordinance. This was the general Senfe. in which not only the Adult Fews, but all their Infants, were God's Disciples, Isa. viii. 16. and bore the Characters of Saints, holy, faithful, elect, beloved, peculiar, &c. because they were all so by Profession, and were set apart and appropriated to God by the distinguishing Marks of his People. Thus faith the Lord, I have separated you from other People, and ye shall be Holy unto me; for I the Lord am Holy, and have severed you from other People, that ye should be mine, Lev. xx. 24, 26. And this is the current Language of the New Testament also, to describe Christ's Disciples, as Dr. Whithy and others have made appear. In this incomplete Notion, Infants are Christ's Disciples when baptized, and may bear the other Titles. So they are reckoned among the Species of Mankind, are Members of Families, and Subjects of a Commonwealth. Rights they have here, which, if invaded, the Law will vindicate, and do them Justice. But to the Service and Duties of Subjects they are not tied, except only to what

may be done by Proxy.

Christ appropriates Infants to himself, when he commands they should be brought unto him, and fays, that of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. And fo he does little Children, when he declares; Whofo shall receive one such little Child in my Name, receiveth me, Matt. xviii. s. To receive them in his Name imports, that he has a peculiar Right in, and Relation to them, as Persons belonging to himself whom he particularly loves. So the Phrase [In bis Name] fignifies in other Places. Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of those little ones, a Cup of cold Water in the Name of a Disciple, verily I say unto you, be shall in no wife lose his Reward, Chap. x. 42. Which is thus in St. Mark ix. 41. Whosoever shall give you to drink in my Name, because ye belong to Christ. Therefore, to receive little Children in his Name, is to receive them as his Disciples. For if they had no special Relation to him as Disciples and Members of his Body, why should he take to himself the Kindnesses that are shewed to such little Children in his Name? Does he ever use such indearing Language towards Heathens and Infidels that are out of hisChurch and Fold, and therefore out of his peculiar Care and Affection, while they fo continue? Aliens and Strangers they are that belong not to him; yea, Enemies, Rom. v. 10. For it is only the Spiritual Relation of Fraternity and Brotherhood to him, that grounds fuch Appropriations. Verily I fay unto you, Inasmuch as ye have, or have not, done it unto one of the least of these my Brethren, ye have, or have not, done it unto me, Matt. xxv. 40, 45. To Christ therefore such little Children do belong as his Brethren and Disciples. For, Believers also in him they are there called, Matt. xviii. 6. Whoso shall offend one of these little Ones that believe in me. Meaning it of, and probably pointing to, that very little Child he had then before him. Such a little One in Age, not only in Temper and Disposition: Such a little One as that was whom he made a Pattern to his Disciples, and proposed him as an Emblem of Humility and Conversion to all; whom he gave them Encouragement to receive in his Name; and whom he now says, that he and such like believed in him. So the Subject he speaks of was not varied.

4. As to the Injunctions, Letter, &c. of that venerable Council; To whom in Civil or Ecclesiastical Bodies, are such Acts directed, but to the most eminent Persons? To the Chiefs, Heads, Principals, or Governors, who, as the Body Representative, command and influence the reft, act in their Name. and determine them by their Acts? They all stand incorporated together, and the Acts of the Principals, are the Acts of the whole Body, while those that are under Government are not excluded, but always included in the general Accounts. And fo the Disciples in that History of the Ads, were Believers, purified by Faith, &c. because the Heads and most eminent Members were so. Yet were Infants still of the Body, as in the Fewish Church. Were Mr. Gale to describe a Member of the Church of England, it is like he would fay, He was one that held to Episcopacy as of Divine Right, ferved God by the Establish'd Liturgy, and so on-Surely, he would be a Wife Man that would conclude from thence, the Church of England acknowledged no Infants for its Members, because they know not what Episcopacy and Liturgies mean. In such Ca-fes, Historians, studying Brevity while they relate Passages and Transactions, regard only the Principals or eminent Persons of the Body, and are not bound

bound to be nice in their Distinctions and Definitions.

s. For this way of Reckoning there is good Reafon. because the Heads influence and over-rule the others. Parents dispose of their Infants and little Children as they please, and bring them into their own Religion. And so they commonly do their Housholds. Abraham commanded his Children and Houshold to ferve God, and by his Order they were circumcifed. Foshua ingages, that his House should serve the Lord, Fosh. xxiv. 15. And in the History of the Apostles Alls, the Conversions of the Heads converted the whole Families. Never were there any Parents that did not devote and dedicate their little Children to the Service of the God, or Gods, whom they themselves worshipped. Never fince the Church of God was organized into a Regular Body, in Abraham's Days to Christ's, were Infants left out of the Church; and before that, we believe the little Children were always of their Fathers Religion, while in their Power. And never was there a Commonwealth of which Infants were not Members. Gale and his Party may, by their Sophistical Arguments, as well fourn Infants out of the Human Species, out of Families, and out of all Civil Communities, as out of the Church of God. For it is their Natural Right to be devoted to the Service of their Maker, as it is their Parents Duty to devote them.

How upon their Terms the Baptists will defend the Universality of the Christian Church, is plainly unaccountable. The Fall in Adam was universal. So, by God's Design was Redemption, Grace and Salvation through Christ. And so was the Church of Christ intended to be, to which Salvation by God's Word and Covenant is now appropriated. Catholic, or Universal, it is in our Creeds, and in the Baptists too, Article 8. Then should it extend to Persons of all Ages, Sexes and Conditions. But if

Children,

Children, till they have actual Faith and Repentance, be excluded from the Church, without their Fault, how great a Part of Mankind are they? How by God's Word do they partake in Christ's Redemption and saving Grace? And how is his Holy Church Catholic and Universal? Is it not in this respect more limitted and particular than the Hebrew Church was from Abraham to Christ?

The Hints I have here given may lead the Reader into a Train of Thoughts upon this Subject, that are agreeable to the Nature of Things, to the Methods of God in modelling his Church, and to the Laws and common Cuftoms of Mankind. If God has made it impossible for Infants to be Visible in the Church, it is impossible for the Visible

Church to be Universal.

What more common in the later Parts of Scripture, than to call all the Ancient Fews by the Name of Fathers? Had they therefore no Females, Batchelors and Infants among them, by reason these cannot be properly called Fathers? Or did none of these go under the Cloud, and pass through the Sea, because they are all called Fathers that did so? I Cor. x. 1. Or did none of them eat of the Manna in the Desart, because they that did so are stilled Fathers, Fohn vi. 31, 49.? And were none of old circumcised but Fathers properly so called with Apostles and Elders, because in this very controverted. Text the Apostle says, A Yoke which neither our Fathers nor we were able to bear? Why are not Infants excluded from that Yoke, since they could not properly be Fathers, nor Apostles and Elders, as well as they are excluded from Discipleship, because they could not as properly as some others, be Believers, have their Hearts purified by Faith, receive Letters and Injunctions? What then is all this but to equivocate and play upon Words, to cast

a Mist before our Eyes, and try if we cannot be

bubbled out of Common Sense?

V. Our next Proof for Infant-Baptism shall be grounded on I Cor. vii. 14. The unbelieving Husband is fantlified by the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is fantified by the Husband; else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy. The Construction which Dr. Hammond, Mr. Wall and others have put upon this Text, I leave to those that like it best; and shall follow my own Sense, which has been the most common; because I think it most agreeable to the Language and Tenor of the Scriptures. And I

shall briefly give it thus:

The Fewish Converts retaining their old Prepoffessions, thought themselves bound by the Law of God to have no Inter-marriages with Infidels; and if marry they did with them, they thought Converse and Cohabitation with them to be polluting. Then they knew that by the old Law unclean Persons must for the Time be separated from the Congregation. How then could they have constant Matrimonial Society with fuch Conforts, and not be defiled and excluded from the Christian Assemblies? This was their Case, and the Corinthians

wrote to St. Paul for a Resolution of it.

He answers, That the Unbeliever, in the Account of Christianity, was so far from polluting the Believer, that he was rather sanctified by him, or in him. Else if the Believers became unclean by Cohabitation, and must be barred, like Heathens, from Religious Communion, their Children also would be counted unclean, but now they are holy. The Believer was holy by Profession, the Unbeliever was only fanctified for his Use by God's Account, or Act of Acceptance; as Meats are held fanctified by the Word of God and Prayer, 1 Tim. iv. 5. This is no other than an external Quality of Holiness and San-Etification, not internal or inherent. Grace follows

the more favourable fide, and gives the Believer the Advantage over the Infidel. So chiefly for the Believer's fake, their common Children were Holy.

For this was an Affection which, by Virtue of God's Covenant, always accompanied professed Believers, and their Children. A Holy Seed they were, Nehem. ix. 2. Isa. vi. 13. and they and their Off-spring were the Blessed of the Lord for Ever, Chap. lxv. 23. And this Holiness, with the like Privileges, still accompanies Christians, I Per. ii. 9. 'Tis commonly called Federal, as depending on God's gracious Covenant; or Relative, because of their Covenant Relation with God; or Radical, For if the Root be holy, so are the Branches, Rom. xi. 16.; or Seminal, because it is the Native Prerogative of the Holy Seed. A Quality therefore that does not inwardly affect their Souls, but their outward State and Condition by God's Original Charter to Abraham. As in Corporations, he that is Born of a Freeman, is Free; so was St. Paul born a Roman Citizen, Als xxii. 28. or Freeman of Rome.

And as they and their Children were counted holy; so Heathens and their uncircumcifed Off-spring were counted unclean, Ads x. 28. Isa. xxxv. 8. and lii. 1. And in Titus i. 15. the Defiled and Unbeliev.

ing are linked together.

This, therefore, is the Current Language of the Holy Ghost, and our Interpretation is licensed by Divine Authority. And thus we ground our Argu-

ment upon it for Padobaptism.

To the Antient Patriarchal Church of God, we and our Children, as his Holy and Peculiar People, succeed in all their Spiritual Privileges. Therefore must we have the same Treatment. A Federal Holiness they had by Intail for ever, and that intitled them and their Infants to the Covenanting Ordinance; that admitted them into the Church and Society of the Faithful. Upon the same Foot and Le-

vel

vel exactly, do the Infants of Christian Parents stand with theirs. A Federal Holiness they still have, as theirs had; therefore have they the same Title to the Covenanting Ordinance, and to solemn Admission into the Church. For the Gift and Calling of God are without Repentance. And the Rule is good, Paria paribus conveniunt. They that are upon equal Ground, must have equal Usage in Point of Privilege. The same Badge and Character of Holiness they now wear as they did of old; and when we present and dedicate them unto God with this Stamp of the Holy Seed, we believe he will kindly receive them, and acknowledge his own Mark and Impression.

The Consequence is sound and rational, and runs parallel with another that the Jews drew in a Case not much unlike, and it was approved: The Law said, Every Male that openeth the Womb shall be Holy unto the Lord. But it no where commanded it should be brought to the Temple, and there be presented unto God. Yet that Inference the Jews made; so was their Practice, and so was Christ presented in Approbation of it, Luke ii. 22, 23. Therefore such Inferences in positive Rights, are not weak

and unlawful.

Vain then is their Objection who fay, "It is not "Holiness that gives a Right to Baptism, but God's Command and Precept." For it is a Sound Inference from, and Practice upon his old Command to Abraham. And it is a Claim of Privilege wherein he invested the Holy Seed for Ever.

Others wisely observe, that if such a Holiness intitles the Children to Baptism, it will as well intitle the Unbelieving Parents to it, because they also are fanctified. Right, if they can prove them descended from the Holy Line; and married Persons, who have Children of their own, to be Infants in Age. Otherwise they ought to know our Doctrine and

and Practice about the Adult. Mr. Gale's Extent of Infancy to 21 Years by the English Laws, may

do, but his 10 or 14 Years hardly will.

Let. XIII. p 515. he presses our Notion with Abfurdity, and making St. Paul to utter a Falshood. For, says he, the only Reason why Infants are to " be admitted to Baptisin, St. Paul says, according to the Padobaptists, is, that one of the Parents is Christian; but if so, then all others, tho' brought to be baptized by ever fo good Sureties, are not " to be admitted, for they are unclean. This, he " fays, is contrary to God's infinite Goodness and " Justice, to the Hypothesis of the most judicious " Pædobaptists, to the Jewish Dispensation and Practice, and limits the Grace of Christ to narrower Bounds."

In all which Paragraph there is much to surprize us, but nothing to puzzle or perplex us. For, do we not plainly lay the Grounds of admitting Infants into the Church by Baptism, as God laid them to Abraham by Circumcision? Was not this Grace and Privilege thereby limitted to the Children of Believers? Or was there any Provision made for circumcifing the Infants of Proteffed Infidels? One of the Parents, at least, must become a Proselyte before his Male-Infants were circumcifed; and I think he must be the Father; for Timothy was uncircumcial fed in his Infancy, because his Father was a Greek, though his Mother was a fewefs. Unclean they were all, while they continued Heathens; and so neither Parents nor Infants were circumcifed. Clean they became upon Conversion, and so they and theirs were circumcifed. Unclean are Infidels, fays St. Paul, and therefore not to be baptized; but if both or one Parent turn Christian, he and his Infant Children are Clean or Holy, and so to be baptized. And what more parallel than this in the L 2

Two Dispensations? Or did God's Law make any

other Provision?

The Fews, without any Rule, went farther: For if they found a Heathen Infant exposed, or took him in War, they circumcifed and baptized him too, and brought him up in their own Religion. And so, according to the most judicious Padobaptists, may Christians baptize him; for the Faith and Act of the Sureties that present him, and ingage for his Education, and so become his spiritual Parents, are fomething equivalent to the Prerogative of a Holy Birth in the Seed of Abraham. But wherefore should those Gentlemen talk of limitting the Grace of Christ, and our acting contrary to the Goodness and Justice of God, in not admiting the Infants of Infidels unto Baptisin, when they themselves will admit unto it never an Infant of Infidel or Believer? And if they fay, God's Grace is common to Infidels with Believers, or that such a Limitation of it, as as they speak of, is inconsistent with God's Good-ness and Justice, do they not talk in the Language of a Deist?

Mr. Stennett against Russen says; "I find not that "the Apostle determines his Words to Infants, any more than to Adult Children; therefore if the Infants, one of whose Parents was a Believer, were Church-Members, which Mr. Russen supposes meant by the Word [Holy] all Adult Children may be supposed to have been Church-Members too, as soon as one of their Parents became a Be-

" liever."

But it does not follow; for to Infants it was the Privilege of their Birth among the fews; and owing to their Parents Conversion among Proselytes. But the Adult Children of these Proselytes must have the same personal Qualifications with their Parents, before they could be admitted into Church Communion with the fews. And St. Paul understanding

the

the Laws and Customs of his Country, must in this Matter speak agreeably to them.

Also in the next Page, which is 248. he adds: " Seeing the Unbelieving Parent is faid to be fanctifi-

" ed by the Believer, the Holiness of the Children must be derived as well from the Sanctification of the unbelieving Parent, as that of the Believer; " and therefore must regard the Lawfulness of their

" Conjugal Relation. Whereupon he concludes, " that the Sanctity of the Children may well be un-" derstood of their Legitimacy. And Mr. Gale chimes in with him;" Let. XIII. p. 516.

This Notion of Conjugal and Legitimate Holiness, shall be examined presently. But suppose what is faid before is true, though I grant it not; that the Childrens Holiness derives as well from the Unbelieving, as the Believing Parent; yet all the Sanctification that the Unbeliever had, was from the Believer, or for his fake, and upon his Account. Whatever Holiness, therefore, the Unbeliever transferred unto the Children, it was the Believer's originally, and to his Account it must all be placed; which is as much as needs be faid to that Article.

But the quaint Notions of a Matrimonial and Legitimate Holiness, and of a Spurious or Bastard Uncleanness, shall in few Words be quite exploded

out of Doors.

For if the Lawfulness of the Marriage and Cohabitation, fanctifies the State, and the Lawful Issue, then were all Heathens duly married, and their Issue sanctified. For, who can deny that their Marriages and Cohabitation were lawful? If, fo, almost all the Heathen World is sanctified. Notion, therefore, proves nothing, because it proves abundantly too much, and runs the Abettors into a gross Absurdity. Neither can these Notions ever be supported by the Authority of the Sacred Writers, nor of the Profane either, as I am perswaded.

I. For L 2

1. For the Matrimonial or Conjugal Holiness. the only Pretences I can find alledged, are I Theff. iv. 4. where Chastity is called Sanctification and Honour; and Heb. xiii. 4. where Marriage is faid to be honourable. But is Chastity Matrimony, or Honour Sanctity? Do they not to all Mens Minds, that know any Distinctions between Things and Things, present very different Ideas from one another? He that knows not this, had need go to Mr. Lock's Book of Human Understanding, as well as to his Methods of Education. But is not Matrimony a State of Chastity? Yes, in itself; but in the Use it may, and it may not be so. So are Celibacy, Widdower ship, and all lawful States of Life. Therefore Matrimony, in this respect, founds no Privilege. But is it not a Remedy against Fornication and Uncleanness? Yes, and yet may not be Chastity in its proper Notion. For so is Physic a Remedy against Sickness, and yet Physic is not properly Health.

Yet I grant that Matrimony is a Holy Ordinance, as it was instituted by God in Paradise, during the State of Man's Innocency, and as it represents the Mystical Union between Christ and his Church. But what Claims have lapsed Insidels in behalf of their Marriages from a Paradisiacal State of Innocence, and from the Mystical Representations of the Christian Church? These are nothing to them, and they must, in spite of their Hearts, go without the Holiness, as well as the Grace and Salvation, which their good Friends, the Antipadobap-

tifts, have supplied them with.

2. For the Holiness of Legitimacy in the Children, the Evidence is as much or more deplorably bad. What necessary Connexion is there between Holy and Lawful? And how many Things are the Last which are not the First? As well may Children be called Wise, Strong, Learned, &c. as

Holy.

Holy, only because they are Legitimate. However, Mr. Stennett, and some others, take their Foundation from Mal. ii. 15. where he fays, the Prophet is speaking against Polygamy, where he speaks indeed against Divorces. But to pass this by, the Prophet's Words are these; For did not he make One? Yet had he the Residue of the Spirit. And wherefore One? That he might feek a Godly Seed. Which obscure Place must refer, either to God's making Adam and Eve one, by Matrimony in Paradise, or else to his making Abraham one, as the Stem of the Church, and Root of the Holy Seed and Branches. But what is either of these to the Marriages and Seed of Unbelievers? Can they pretend an Interest in Holiness from Paradise or the Church of God in Abraham's Family, when they are Sinners of the Gentiles, out of the Church, and out of the Covenant? Spurious therefore and Illegitimate is this Account of a Legitimate Holiness in the Children of Heathens.

3. As deflitute and abandoned of all good Support, is the Bastard Uncleanness which next follows. For how come Base-born Children to be unclean? Do they contract it upon themselves by any Act of their own? Are they accessary to their Parents Sin? Or can it be transmitted into their Souls by Propagation? Where has God established this Law for Infants, as we believe was done in Adam's Transgreffion? The Parents Uncleanness is a Moral Impurity, and if into their illegitimate Issue they can transinit any Uncleanness, it must be such as they themselves have, and are guilty of, when they beget This, I suppose, will not be affirmed; else the Children may be charged with all the Immoralities of their immediate Parents, which by this account will descend from Generation to Generation. Yet the Baptists themselves allow, that Pharez, Zarab, Fephthab, and many others of an illegitimate L 4 Birth. Birth, were holy Persons, and within the Covenant. Therefore Bastardy is not Uncleanness in a Moral

Sense, nor was it ever so reputed in a Legal.

Some roundly affert, it is called Uncleanness Deut. xxiii. 2. but very falfly; for what we there read is this: A Baffard shall not enter into the Congregation of the Lord: even to his Tenth Generation (i. e. for ever, Neh. xiii. 1.) shall he not enter into the Congregation of the Lord. If Uncleanness was the Reason of his Exclusion, then all the Posterity of a Bastard must be unclean for ever; because his Exclusion for that Reason is for ever. But the Word Bastard is not there to be understood in our common Sense, provided we may rely on Mr. Selden's Judgment; who fays, that Manzer, which we render Bastard, is one born of any fuch incestuous Mixtures as the Law forbad, except only of a Woman in her Uncleanness, De Fure Nat. &c. 1. 5. c. 16. And of entring into the Congregation of the Lord, Simeon de Muis gives this Construction; That such a one shall not be admitted for ever to the Political or Ecclefiaftical Government, nor, by Marriage with a Fewess, obtain the Privileges of a Few. And with this Opinion Munster, Fagius, Grotius, and others, do in part accord.

But were it so, that the World Bastard should be taken in the common Sense, and that to enter into the Congregation, is to injoy Church Communion in the ordinary Meaning of the Phrase; yet Uncleanness is not specified in the Text as the Reason that debarred him of that Privilege, nor need it at all be understood. For the Law laid hold on corporal Desects and Blemishes for that End, ver. 1. and of pure Unkindness to God's People, ver. 3. Then bare Illegitimacy of Birth is as good a Reason as those Blemishes for that Exclusion. So nothing can be collected to savour that Spurious Uncleanness

from this Scripture.

To

To help out at a dead Lift, Mr. Stennett fays, "That the Jews who broke the Law of God in "marrying Idolatrous Wives, were ordered by the Prophet Ezra to put away those Wives, and fuch as were born of them, as unclean. "Ezra x. 2. 3. But does the Text call those Children unclean? Or does it assign That as the Reason why they were put away? No, it is only Mr. Stennet's own Gloss, and no-body's beside, that I know of, except *Junius* and *Tremellius*, who fay, those Births were impure by Law, though they neither do nor can produce the Law. Indeed both Wives and Children were put away as Illegal, not as Unclean; unless we understand by Uncleanness, their Idolatries and Superstitions, which belong'd to them as Heathens, and is nothing to the present Purpose. Whereupon Grotius has this Comment: "The Sons are here commanded to follow the " Mother, as is the Custom in unlawful Mar-" riages; this Cause also supervening, lest being "educated in Superstitions they should corrupt their Children." And so still there is nothing of an illegitimate Uncleanness here mentioned or supposed. Therefore the Baptists Accounts of these Matters, are all unscriptural and unwarrantable.

VI. On Feb. 4. 1717. I had a private Conference with one Mr. William Wood, a Baptist Teacher in these Parts, when an Argument was managed between me and him, with his Affo-

ciates, to this Effect.

Owen. We read in 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. All our Fathers, i. e. all the Children of Israel, were under the Cloud, and all passed through the Sea: And were all baptized unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea. Among them were Infants or little Children, Exod. x. 10. All these, as well as the Parents, were baptized unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea; and so became his Disciples.

ciples. Then, ver. 11. it is said, Now all these Things happened to them for Ensamples, and are written for our Admonition, upon whom the Ends of the World are come. Therefore we are bound to receive the Admonition, and follow our Ensamples, by baptizing our Infants unto Christ, and making them his Disciples, as those Infants by Baptism were made Disciples unto Moses.

Wood. Were the Children of Israel made Disciples

to Moses by that Baptism?

Owen. Yes, they were made his Disciples, as he was God's Prophet Extraordinary, to declare his Laws unto his People. Therefore it is said, Exod. xiv. 31. They believed the Lord, and his Servant Moses.

Wood. It does not appear there was any Water in that Cloud.

Owen. But there was enough in the Sea, to plunge them over Head and Ears, if that had been necessary. And, perhaps, the strong Wind raising the Water into the Air, might sprinkle them all therewith in their Passage through the Sea. Whence it may be prov'd, that Baptism does not necessarily imply Dipping, were we now disputing on that Subject: because here was a Baptism without Dipping, though there wanted not Plenty of Water for the Purpose. [Something was replyed to this last Clause, but what it was I do not remember, nor does it affect the present Argument.]

Wood. That Baptism in the Cloud and in the

Sea, was Metaphorical.

Owen. Suppose it was Metaphorical, i. e. improper, figurative, or typical, yet the Figure must be sulfill'd in the Truth, and the Type in the Antitype. Therefore, as the fews Infants were baptiz'd in the Type and Figure unto Moses, so must ours be baptiz'd in the Antitype and Truth

unto Christ Jesus; else we come not up to our Exemplars. The Types and Figures of the Old Testament were but Shadows; the Gospel Truth is the Substance; and the Shades are not of the same Kind with the Substance, nor the Types equal in Dignity with the Antitypes. A Resemblance and Similitude between both is sufficient.

Wood. And were all the mixt Multitude that came up with Israel out of Ægypt, baptiz'd unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea, and made his

Disciples?

Owen. Yes; for they were convinced, by the Signs and Wonders they saw in Egypt, that the God of the Jews was the true God, and their Religion the true Religion; they were therefore encouraged to follow their Camp. And at the Red Sea they also believed the Lord, and his Servant Moses. Nor is it otherwise credible, that God would lead a Multitude of professed Insidels and Idolators with his People to partake in their Fortunes. Besides, they were the Strangers God made a Covenant with in the Land of Moab, together with the Jews, Deut. xxix. 11.

Wood. You may as well argue from hence, that Infants should be received to the Lord's Supper. For the Apostle adds, ver. 3, 4. And they did all eat the same Spiritual Meat, and did all drink the same Spiritual Drink, for they drank of that Spiritual

Rock that followed them.

Owen. That Spiritual Meat and Rock was Christ; and when you can prove Christ to be the same with his Supper, and justify the Popish Doctrine of Transubstantiation; I will grant your Consequence to be good.

Mercer. (Another Baptist Teacher) But Christ is

called the Passover.

Owen. True; but he is not call'd his Supper, nor his Supper the Passover. He is call'd the Passover

in relation to the Paschal Lamb of the Fews, which typisied his Sacrifice, but did not typisy his Supper, nor had any direct Relation to it. Therefore we read, Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us.

Smith. (Another of the same Profession) Will you prove Infant Baptism by Types and Figures?

(This he urg'd twice or thrice).

Owen. Yes, that I will by any Scripture, Arguments; especially when those Types and Figures are applied to my Use by the Holy Ghost, made my Ensamples, and I am admonish'd to follow them, and fulfil them. Did not St. Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews, from the Types and Figures of the Law, prove the Priefthood and Sacrifice of our bleffed Saviour, which are of greater Importance than Baptism?

Wood. The Fews are afterwards faid by the Apostle to be guilty of many wicked Things; and must we follow them as Ensamples in those

wicked Things?

Owen. O Mr. Wood! you shall not catch me at that Lock; for there are Ensamples to be avoided, as well as follow'd. The good we must follow, and avoid the bad; and among the good was the Children of Ifrael's being baptiz'd unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea.

Smith. You infift on the Word All; then were all

the Beafts baptiz'd too?

Owen. That Gentleman feems to understand the Scripture just as St. Francis of Affife did, who finding there this Precept, Go, preach the Gospel to every Creature, went and preach'd it to the Mag-pies, because they were Creatures.

This Story I took by Tradition, and whether it was St. Francis, or St. Anthony of Padua, or neither, I am not responsible; but it was the fittest Answer I could give to Folly; and it put the Company to Laughter, and the Gentleman to the ConConfusion of a Blush, though he appear'd to have an excellent Frontispiece of his own.

There this Argument ended, and who had the best on it I submit to Judgment. My Antagonist Mr. Wood told me since, he had seen this Account, and had nothing to object against its Truth. Only he had something more to say to the Argument; which, by his Intimations, I take to be what I shall now observe.

For I have a little wondred with my felf, that they did not at all except against my Sense of the Word Fathers, when I made it to signify and comprehend all the Children of Israel, or the whole collective Body of the Fews. For Infants, surely, could not be call'd Fathers, therefore they were not included in that Baptism. If so, then Females, Batchelors, and all that had no Children, could not be included for the same Reason. But to clear this

feeming Difficulty;

1. This Phrase, All our Fathers, must bear a Sense that will comprehend all the Persons to whom the Actions or Incidents there mention'd, did belong. True it is of Men, Women and Children, that they were all under the Cloud, and all passed through the Sea; that they did all eat of the same Spiritual Meat, and all drank of that Spiritual Drink. Therefore were they all baptiz'd unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea. And in that Latitude must the Word Fathers be understood, since there is no Restriction used here, as in another Case is done; ver. 5. So the Baptism being express'd with a Note of Universality, extended to every living Soul in Ifrael, as the other Actions did. And to call them Fathers, is but a compendious Way of Reckoning, very usual in the Scriptures, to express the whole Body under the Names of the most dignified.

2. Doubt-

2. Doubtless the Apostle by Fathers, means the very same Persons the Inspired Writers of the Old Testament meant, when they related the same Passage in the Historical Account of it. And they speaking thereof, call the Persons therein concerned, sometimes Fathers, as in Psal. lxxviii. 12, 13. and sometimes, The Children of Israel, as in Exod. xiv. 22. and Numb. ix. 17, Esc. which shews those Two Expressions, in this Account, to be equipollent.

3. Fathers, and our Fathers they are called, not in a Natural, but a Spiritual Sense. In a Natural Sense, Fathers they could not be termed to all the Church at Corinth; among whom were many Gentile Converts, who descended not of Fewish Paren-Fathers then they were in a Spiritual Relation, because the Israelites were all together the Ancient Church and People of God, professing his Religion, and admitted into his Covenant. So they were our Ancestors, Predecessors and Fore-runners in the Faith and Worship of the True God, which they handed down to their late Posterity, and to the Church of Christ. From the whole Body of them have we received the Benefit, and are equally beholden for it to Old and Young, Males and Females; because they professed the Faith and True Religion of God before us, and transmitted it down into our Hands. Wherefore, Fathers is but a Name of Dignity and Reverence, to express our Seniors or Predecessors in the Faith; and it comprehends all the Holy Seed and Spiritual Children of God, begotten before us in the Church. Thus Commentators understand it in the Text, and it is the Common Acceptation of the Word in Scripture, to denote the Ancient Church and Nation of the Fews. Any one may be satisfied of it, that will but peruse Psal. Ixxviii. and cvi. John vi. Alls vii. beside other Scriptures, where the Word frequently occurrs in this Sense.

IF

INFANT-BAPTISM, &c. 175

If it be objected, that Baptism is but a Rite or Ceremony; and to fore-shadow Ceremonies, there could be no Types and Figures. I answer, St. Peter was not of this Mind, when he makes the Waters of Noah's Flood to fore-shadow Baptism, as the Type the Antitype, I Pet. iii. 20, 21. The Waters in both did correspond, and so may our Baptism with that of the Fews in the Cloud and in the Sea.

The Scriptural Evidences I thought fit to produce for Infant-Baptism, are now finished; and if any one of them does prove unanswerable, that alone is sufficient, and as good as an Hundred. Moreover, the Scriptures being God's infallible Word, cannot contradict themselves, by making that unlawful in one Place, which they make lawful and dutiful in another. Consequently, the Places cited out of them to disprove Infant-Baptism, must of Necessity have a different Sense and Construction from what our Adversaries put on them, provided our Arguments for it be good and valid.





THE

LAWFULNESS

Infant-BAPTISM,

Proved from

SCRIPTURE.

PART III.



HAT remains of my Task unperformed, is, to take off the Baptists Arguments and Objections from Scripture against Infant Baptism. Strong and plain they ought to be, before they can overthrow our Evidences for it,

and by destroying an ancient Divine Charter, disposses so many Infants of the great Privileges they injoyed ever since God preached the Gospel unto Abraham, and made them Citizens with his Saints, by the Evangelical Covenant. Clear and uncontestable was their Investiture, long and uninterrupted their Possession; and Disfranchisement being a Hardship, and Odious Case, should be no less plain and indisputable; else, the Favourable side should be chosen. Not by Consequences, but by express Com-

Command, they came at first into that Noble Corporation the City of God, and there maintained their Claim and Right; nor should it be by Confequences, but by express Command, that they should now appear excluded. And yet Consequences are all that is urged against their Right. There are Three or Four Texts to this Purpose to be examined, and I think in answering them, I shall enervate the whole Strength of our Adversaries Caufe.

1. I shall take into Consideration St. Peter's Words. 1 Epist. iii. 21. The like Figure whereunto even Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience toward God) by the Resurrection of Fesus Christ. "These Words of St. Peter, fays Mr. Gale, " Let. XI. p. 416, 417. are an impregnable For-" tress of Antipadobaptism; and all the Attempts of " our Adversaries against them hitherto, have been " unfuccessful, and will probably ever be so. Dr. " Hammond trifles upon them most egregiously, " &c." The Expressions of this Gentleman are commonly very terrible, and his Positions decretory. But I am by this Time so well acquainted with his Style and Management, that I am not at all startled with his big Words and bold Affeverations. For where I fee the most Flashing, there I find the least Execution. If his Fortress be really impregnable, why does he fay, our Attempts against it will be but probably for ever unsuccessful? Lie down we must before it, and despair; because impregnable Forts can never possibly be stormed and taken. But before I lay close Siege to his Bulwark, I have an Account to make up with him for an Expression he has dropped about the Type of this Baptism.

Some Crotchet or other possessed Sir N. Knatchbul's Head to make Noah's Ark, and not the Waters of the Floud, to be the Type of St. Peter's Baptism. As others of his Party have done, so Mr. Gale falls in with Sir Norton; "The Apostle Peter makes " our Baptisin to be the Antitype of the Ark, Let. " X. p. 372." The Ark then must be the Type. By this I perceive that if one great Man starts a: Notion, though ever so false and absurd, other great Men and Critics will run away with it unexamined; especially if it can make for the Interest of their Cause. But where then is the apparent Resemblance between the Ark and Baptism, that ought to be between the Type and the Antitype? An Ark is an odd Figure to represent an Ordinance. And to maintain the Correspondence between them, are they the Persons, and not rather the Houses and Churches wherein Christians are; that ought to be dipped in Water and baptized? For the Ark it was that was properly in the Water, and that was a fitter Figure to represent material Buildings, than human Persons.

But why should not such Learned Men as Sir. Norton and Mr. Gale confult the Original, before they venture their ridiculous Notions into the World? For St. Peter in the very beginning of the Verse has the Relative Article &, which is in the Neuter Gender, and by the Rules of Grammar can by no means agree with use of the Ark, which is of the Feminine; but with & A. O., the Water, immediately aforegoing, which is of the same Gender with 6. To the Water therefore Baptism must be the Antitype, and not to the Ark, unless they will fix a gross Solecism upon St. Peter, as they endeavour to do a blundring Notion on the World. But that Affront they cannot possibly pass upon the Apostle, because he understood his Rules, as appears by his 107nforning a Participle of the Right Gender with the

Ark, in the Verse before.

Here then the Correspondence will easily appear. For the Waters of Noah's Flood drowning that finful Age, as the Red Sea afterwards did the Egyptians. bore up the Ark upon their Surface; which fitly represented the Church Militant toss'd about in the Waves of this troublesome World, but always faved by the Hand of Providence. Noah's Entrance with his Family into the Ark, upon the Rising of the Waters, represented our Entrance by Baptismal Water into the Church, in which Salvation is to be found. And if, as Waters are used to cleanse. they farther fignified the Purification of our Souls from Sin by Sacramental Grace, the Account of our Baptism, as a saving Ordinance, will be fully

compleated in the Figure.

Having dispatched this Reckoning with Mr. Gale, I come to attack his main Fort. The Strength of it lies in this; That it is not the washing with Water, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God; that is, St. Peter's Saving Baptism. This Answer, Infants can never have in their Infant-State, wherein we baptize them; therefore, they should not be baptized. And then, to give them a Baptism that is not Saving, is vain. Dr. Whitby, by a true and judicious Observation, lay across his Way, and him he tries to remove. In Answer to it, the Doctor observes on the Place; "St. Paul also saith, That the true Circumcision before God, is not the outward Circumcision of " the Flesh, but the inward Circumcision of the "Heart and Spirit, Rom. ii. 29. But will any one hence argue, That the Fewish Infants, for " want of this, were not to be admitted into Cove-" nant with God by Circumcifion? And yet the " Argument is plainly parallel." And so he goes on to demonstrate it.

How does Mr. Gale go about to overthrow this? I must beg leave to tell him, 'tis by facing us down with two Untruths, in plain Defiance and Contradiction to St. Paul. And, first, he is of Opinion, " the Cases are not at all parallel. For the Baptism which saves, is expresly described and li-" mitted to be, I. Not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh: But, 2. The Answer of a good Con-6 science. Whereas St. Paul's Words do not im-" port, that the only Circumcifion which faved was, 1. Not the Circumcifion of the Flesh: But, " 2. The Circumcifion of the Heart and Spirit." Does he not; indeed? Let us hear him speak in his own Terms; Rom. ii. 28, 29. Circumcision is not that which is outward in the Flesh - But Circumcision is that of the Heart, in the Spirit. Is not this parallel to St. Peter's Words? Let any Man compare both Places, and be Judge. Nay, are not St. Paul's Words the strongest of the two? For St. Peter does not fay, That the washing with Water is no Baptism at all, but only that it is not the Saving Baptism. Whereas if we interpret St. Paul's Words in Mr. Gale's rigid Way, he fays, the Circumcifion of the Flesh, is not Circumcifion; no Circumcifion at all, much less faving. Strange it is, that in the Patrons of Error, Assurance should arrive to fuch a Height! But, this being fuch a gross and palpable Untruth, he seems to mistrust it by an However, and flees to another Refuge.

"For St. Paul does not speak of Circumcission while it continued in Force, but as quite abolished under the Gospel." Then, indeed, the outward Circumcission availed nothing, but the inward. But this is no truer than the other. For against whom does St. Paul there dispute? Does not the whole Chapter manifestly shew, it was against the unconverted Jews, who thought the outward Circumcission was still in Force? Then he ar-

gues against them upon that Supposition, and strives to convince them upon Principles that were always true in their own Religion. That this is true, appears undeniably from ver. 25. Circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the Law. Now, I desire to know of Mr. Gale, how Circumcifion, or any thing else, can verily profit, when it is clean abolished and out of Force? No more, furely, than a dead Man can act, as he did while he was alive. The Fews were really always obliged to the Circumcision of the Heart, as much as we Christians are to the Answer of a good Conscience: They by Circumcifion of the Flesh to the one, and we by the Baptism of Water to the other. And let Mr. Gale deny it if he can, or dares. And so the Cases run still parallel, and St. Peter's Words are no stronger against Infant-Baptism, than St. Paul's against Infant-Circumcision. Dr. Whitby's Answer is therefore solid and safe, and Mr. Gale has not touched it in the least. That alone is sufficient; but I will offer some farther Observations to clear the Matter in St. Peter.

... I. When he makes the Baptism which saves, to be the Antitype to the Waters of the Deluge, he does not ascribe all the Virtue of it to the Answer of a good Conscience, but somewhat to the outward Ordinance. For the Nature of an Antitype, in God's Word, is to be a Figure set over against another, and to answer it in that Opposition. And a material or visible Thing it must be, or it cannot be a Figure correspondent to the Type, which is always fo. I have, in my Thoughts, run over, as far as I well could, the Types and Antitypes of the Scripture, and cannot yet think of one Instance to the contrary. But the Answer of a good Conscience is a Thing immaterial, and invisible to all Eyes but those of God, and the Party's inward Senses. Therefore, it cannot be that Antitypical M_{2} Baptifin

Baptism to which St. Peter does fully and wholly ascribe a saving Efficacy, but the visible Baptism claims its share

These external Signs which represent spiritual and invisible Things, are not Types, but Symbols; and if Mr. Gale knows no Difference between these, it is none of my Fault. Consequently he, and the Authors he follows, who, it is like, did not nicely examine those Matters, are out in their Accounts, when they say, the Circumcision of the Elesh typified that of the Heart, Let. XII. p. 446, 447. For to every circumcised few, it symbolically represented the Circumcision of the Heart, to which he always stood obliged so long as he lived. Whereas Types pre-sigured Things at a distance off, which were to be fulfilled in Times to come.

2. The Apostle's Parenthesis, (Not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience toward God) is but a Caution given to his Christian Readers, that they should not misunderstand him, and depend upon the outward Baptisin only for Salvation. And it answers exactly to that of St. Paul to the Fews about Circumcifion. In it St. Peter does not deny all faving Virtue to the Ordinance of Baptisin in the Washing, but he denies the chief and principal; in Comparison whereof, the other finks down almost to nothing. That this is a common Phraseology in the Scripture, I believe, a hundred Places, or more, might be alledged. But if they should be interpreted in Mr. Gale's light and rigid Sense, as he does the Apostle's Parenthesis here, to deny all intirely to the less Principal, and affirm it wholly of the other, what mad Work should we make of the Word of God? For, by his Method, we could prove, that the Jews transgressed the Will of God, if under the old Dispensation they ever offer'd any Sacrifices. For God faid, I will have Mercy, and

not Sacrifice. By his Method we might prove, that Christ would make a wrong Claim, if he claimed any Propriety in his own Doctrine; because he declares, The Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me, John vii. 16. By the same Method we could prove, that St. Paul would have exceeded his Commission, if at all he had administred Christian Baptism; since he himself professes, Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel, I Cor.i. 17. And abundance more such Things we could prove after that Manner. Let our Author therefore consider, into what Absurdities he runs himself by his Quakerly Exposition.

3. But if the Answer of a good Conscience toward God must be fully and wholly the faving Baptism, yet I affirm, that baptized Infants may have this Answer to as good Purpose before God. as any Adult Christian upon Earth. For when by the Grace of God in Baptism the Guilt and Stain of Original Sin are washed off, their Soul and Conscience are as innocent, pure and undefiled in their Maker's Sight, as those of the best Livers in the World. What then if in Infants this Answer be not Vocal, fo long as it is True and Real; Will it not so 'answer God's Demands from Infants? And will it not be heard in His Ears who thus hears the Voices and Cries of inanimate Things? So he heard the Cry of Abel's Blood, of Sodom's Sin, of the Stone and Beam of Timber in the Wall, Hab. ii. 11. of the Martyrs Blood under the Altar, Rev. vi. 10. And, to name no more, so he hears the silent Intercessions of his Son's Merits now in Heaven.

4. Or if Vocal this Answer must needs be, in Infants it may very well serve the turn by Proxy; while the Sureties undertake for their good Education and Behaviour; to which Infants on their side can put no Bar. So are their Civil Affairs in the World transacted, and so they may be transacted.

M 4

for them in Religion, as the Custom of God's Church has been of Old. For such Transactions hold good and valid in their behalf by the Laws of Men; and so they held in Ifrael by the Laws of God and the Church.

5. Let us observe in St. Peter how the Antitypical Baptism saves. He says it is by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. To his Resurrection great Virtue toward our Salvation, is attributed in God's Word. For without it, our Faith is vain, and we are yet in our Sins, I Cor. xv. 17. By it we are justified unto Life, Rom. iv. 25. And by his Life, as risen from the Dead, we are saved, Chap. v. 10. It is not necessary to distinguish in this Case between the Merits of his Death, and the Benefits of his Refurrection. For he that partakes in the last, partakes most certainly in the former. Now if by Baptilm Infants are Members of Christ, and get an Interest in him by a Spiritual Union and Fellowship; and if by Baptismal Grace the Benefits of his Death and Refurrection are actually applied to their Souls; who can deny this to be a faving Baptifm to those Infants?

Mind now in how many Particulars we have upon this Head catched Mr. Gale tripping. 1. He affirms, that St. Paul does not deny the Circumcifion of the Flesh to be saving, as St. Peter does Water-Baptisin; when St. Paul rather denies more. 2. He says, St. Paul speaks of Circumcision, as abolished, and not in Force; when he speaks of it as a Thing which at that Time did verily prosit. 3. That Circumcision of the Flesh was Typical of the Circumcision of the Heart in Christians, when it was evermore Symbolical of it to the Jews and Hebrews. 4. That Baptisin is the Antitype to the Ark, when it is so only to the Water. And 5. That St. Peter denies all saving Virtue whatsoever to the external Ordinance of Baptisin, which is

truly Antitypical; when he denies only the principal Virtue, and really ascribes to That and the Inward, their respective Shares. Not to note, how he pleads and affirms that Infants can, in no sound Sense, (or else he does nothing) have the Answer of a good Conscience toward God; when, I hope, I have shewed the contrary.

Whether Mr. Gale be a fincere Manager, or no, I have Reason to question. For he has given me Cause enough to suspect, that his Integrity halts more than his Ability. But if fincere he is, I must challenge him for a Mean Divine, whatever he is for a Philologer. For, in those Parts that I have examined him, I can find but little Soundness and Orthodoxy. Wherefore, fince he can put his Notions no better together, nor speak more correctly to fuch Matters, I would advise him friendly, never to write again upon Points of Divinity, for fear of exposing himself; for they seem to be far remote from his Province. If at this Freedom he takes Offence, he may thank himfelf for his Contempt and Abuses to other People. Let this suffice for all; for I shall use no more of such Reflexions; orat least, be very sparing.

2. We must now advance to St. Matt. xxviii. 19. Go ye, therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. In St. Peter we lay against an impregnable Fortress, and in St. Matthew we must ingage with a Mathematical Demonstration. But if the Lines of Proportion be not drawn with greater Exactness here, than those of Fortification were done there, we may very boldly make our Ap-

proaches.

Mr. Gale has rallied all his Forces together upon this Topic, exerts his utmost Strength, and is prolix in the Management, because, as he says, it shall serve instead of all the rest. Therefore must I also give it the fuller Examination. "For the only Commission it is for Baptism, which to all Men must regulate the whole Affair; and if here we do not find Infant-Baptism, where else can it be found?" Certainly, any other Place of God's Book may do as well. But before I come to confider his Reasons, I shall observe some Things which will lead us to know, how it was most reasonable for the Disciples to understand their Master.

1. Whether this be the first and only Commission Christ gave his Disciples for Baptizing, may bear some Dispute. For tis certain they baptized before; which they did either with, or without his Order. Without his Order, none I suppose, will fay; but if with his Order, then that was their Commission. For all was then delivered, not in Writing, but by Word of Mouth. An Order therefore they had to baptize Proselytes from among the Fews, and now it is extended to the universal World. Nor was Baptism so necessary before to initiate into the Church, because Circumcision for that Use remained in its full Force. Neither did it succeed in its Room as yet for the same End, because Christ had not yet died, nor was his Church regularly conftituted on its proper Foundations.

Our Saviour's primary Design in the Commission, was the Proselyting or Discipling of all Nations. For the Command runs expresly for that, Go, and teach all Nations. Then having converted them by teaching, he secondly shews, what they were to do with those Converts; namely, to baptize them in the Name of the ever blessed Trinity. So the Principal Thing intended, was, to make Proselytes, and the Command is rather a Commission for that, than for baptizing. For this comes in only as an Accessary to the other. No particular Directions are here for the Manner of Performance of either; but the Proselyting part is

left on the same Foot it used to be before; and in the Room of Circumcision the Baptism is substituted, and made to run in the Name of the Holy Trinity. So the whole Business of Proselytism is left purely on the old Foundation, and the old Ordinance chang'd for a new. This is all the Alteration, and if more had been intended, more had been specified. Why else is there an Order for Change in one Part, and not in another? The only Reason can be, because no more was design'd than is express'd. Wherefore, Proselytism continuing in the same State it was in before;

in that Affair from Abraham to Christ. It is certain the Law brought in all the Infants with their Parents. And Reason suggests, it would never bring in the Parents, or the Adult, like Brute Animals, without any previous Instruction, or Knowledge of the true God and his Religion. Nor could they desire it without a Competency of that Knowledge: For, Ignoti nulla cupido. Much less would they voluntarily embrace such a cumbersome Religion, as the Fewish was under the Mosaical Oeconomy, with-

out Conviction of its Truth.

And of the Church's Practice in that Case, Mr. Selden, who was an able Judge, gives this Account: "The Jews admonished the Person, before he was initiated into their Religion, of several Things; viz. Of the Dignity of their Nation, "The Rewards of the Just and the Punishments of the Unjust, The future World, The Burthen and Weight of the Divine Precepts, "Ec. And they required Conditions of them: For they must promise to embrace the whole Law intirely, not one Ordinance excepted; and profess, that they did it out of pure Love to the Religion." De Jure Nat. &c. 1, 2, c. 2. Here was catechizing the Adult beforehand;

hand; but no such Preliminaries could be obferv'd with Infants, unless by the Mediation of Witnesses or Undertakers: for such he says elsewhere, they had. The Parents Conversion was evermore their Privilege, and under their Wing they enjoy'd the Benefit of Proselytism and Church-Communion. Then,

3. We ought to confider, who the Persons were to whom our Saviour at first gave this Commission. All fews, by Birth and Education, train'd up from their Cradles in those Laws and Usages, and little acquainted with any others. Know they did the Laws of God and the Customs of their Church about Proselytism, which were grown inveterate, and very hardly could they be weaned from

them.

Put these Things together, That the Commission ran for Proselytism; that the Practice of the Church was to instruct the Adult before-hand, and bind them to Conditions, from which Infants were exempted; and that the Persons employed to make the Proselytes, were of Jewish Extraction, accustomed to those Usages; then, what can the Refult be, but that they understood their Lord's Commission in the same Sense, since he gave them no Information to remove their old Prejudices and Opinions? Antecedent Laws and Customs of long Continuance, are the best Light to new Orders in the like Cases, when all Things beside are agreeable. Bound, therefore, they thought themselves to teach the Adult, and initiate Infants without Teaching. And of their Judgment, their Practice is good Evidence. For upon Conversion of the Heads, they baptized several intire Families after the old way; in which only Baptists can believe there was never an Infant nor little Child.

To give this some farther Strength; They knew this Way of Proselytism was a Law of the Evangelical Covenant made with Abraham, which was to last for ever; No Ordinance therefore of Moles's Law, that should be cancell'd. They knew God's Love was as great to converted Gentiles and their Infants, as to Fews; and that there was no Reason given now to abridge these Infants of their ancient Privileges. They knew the Gift and Calling of God to be without Repentance in such Cases, and that their Country-Men were mighty fond their old Rights, Laws and Usages, to which they stiffly adhered, notwithstanding all Endeavours to take them off. Had they, therefore, upon their own Conversion, seen their beloved Infants thrown out of their Religious Society; and fo denied to have God for their Father, the Church for their Mother, the Children of God for their Brethren, and Christ for their Head and Saviour; what a Shock had in been to their Minds, and what a Hindrance to their Conversion?

They knew also, what Affection Christ, on all Occasions, express'd to the young Children of those in Covenant, proposing them as Emblems of Innocence and Humility, and Exemplars of Conversion; calling them to himself, and rebuking those that forbad their coming; embracing, blessing them, and declaring, that of such was the Kingdom of Heaven; encouraging all to receive them in his Name, or as his Disciples, and imputing it as a receiving of himself; and fearfully threatning those that should offend such young Believers. These Actions they had seen, these Words they had heard, and could not, surely, without farther Notice, construe them in that Sense, as that all such Insants were to lose their Covenant Relation with God, and the sacred Franchises they once enjoyed. A Holy Seed they knew them still to be, and the

new initiating Ordinance to be as well fitted for their Purpose, as the old One, and the Borders of the Church to be inlarged. All Nations it would receive into it; and why should Infants, who by the Covenant of Grace had a long uninterrupted Right and Possession there, be cast out, or denied Entrance?

To Persons under all these Prepossessions, did Christ give that very short and concise Command for making Profelytes; and upon what could their Thoughts more naturally run, than on the old Forms and Usages of their Church, to which they had been brought up and inured for the Regulation of the: Matter? If now a great Alteration must be made, and the old Rules of Proselytism must be changed by rejecting Infants, was it not necessary their Lord should plainly tell them so, and not put them to gather it by odd and strain'd Interpretations of his. Words? For, not the least Intimation of his Mind does he give them to remove their former Prepossessions; but his Commission runs in the same Strain as it would have done under Circumcifion; or as we would now give it for profelyting the World by Christian Baptism, in case we would be so short as our Saviour was.

For, suppose Christ had been pleased to retain Circumcision for the initiating Ordinance, and bid his Ministers, Go, teach all Nations, circumcising them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy-Ghost; how would they, being of fewish Descent and Education have understood him, but according to the old Rules and Customs? And how would they have executed their Commission, but by teaching the Adult beforehand, and circumcising Insants without teaching, as was always done in their Church? Now here is only an Exchange of one Word, that of Baptism for Circumcision; but this needs not at all inser any Change in the Subjects of either

Ordinance, nor in the Methods of Execution.

Or, suppose any Church that taught and practifed Padobaptism, should commission a Set of its own Ministers to proselyte some unconverted Nation, in these Words; Go, and teach such a certain Nation, baptizing them in the Name, &c. Would those Ministers exclude the Infant Children of their Converts from Baptism, because they could not be taught? Very ignorant must they be, if they so understood their Commission, or very perverse if they wilfully mis-apply'd it after that manner. For the Doctrine of their Church should guide their Judgment, and the Rules at Home determine their Practice.

This is the Conftruction we give to Christ's Commission; and if the Premises be thus, it is certainly most rational in itself, most agreeable to the Laws and Customs of the Church which were then in Use, and most congruous to the Sentiments of the Ministers he employ'd and commission'd in that Office. And having noted these Things for the right Understanding of the Matter in Hand, I shall next apply my self to examine Mr. Gale's Arguments raised from thence against Insant

Baptism.

Varrants, Patents, &c. which bind only in relation to the Particulars specify'd in them, and must neither be exceeded, nor under-acted in the Execution, but strictly follow'd and obeyed. And thereof he is particular and tedious enough in giving Instances. Then the Substance of his Plea from thence is; "Just so must it be practised in our "Saviour's Law and Commission concerning Bap-" tism. That must regulate our whole Conduct; "so that what we find there specified, we must "observe, and what is there wanting, we must not do; for there is no Variation allowed from our "Rule and Warrant." Herein, indeed, lies the main Strength

Strength of his Argument, but it is really as weak

as we can defire. For.

1. If the Church must be exactly modell'd by the Laws and Maxims of Civil Polities, then, I hope, we shall bring the Infants of Christian Parents. within the Church, by the only Ordinance appointed for that End. For, let him name me the Kingdom. or Commonwealth from Noah, or, if he please, from Adam, that did not recognize the Infant Children of its Subjects, for Subjects, or Members of it too. So must the Church of God do also, as we know it formerly did, if by those Rules it is bound to act.

2. Perhaps his Rule is not always unexceptionable, there being a Liberty of Discretion for the Masters, or the Subjects Benefit, sometimes allow'd in those Orders and Commissions. Else, if it be always an indispensible Duty to follow them closely, Cyrus was out in his Politics, when he preferr'd Chrysant as before Hystaspes, because the first took all Opportunities to promote his Master's Interest by uncommanded Service, while the other contented himself with a punctual Observation of his Orders: Nor was Xenophon very wife in relating this Passage to the Praise of Cyrus and Chrysantas. Such Liberties are not unfrequently taken, and approved; for the Manliana Imperia are not every where in Fashion. But our Author should remember, that his Inflances are but Similitudes or Comparisons, which serve better for Illustrations, than for certain Proofs, because they seldom quadrate, or run current on all Four. This, he and his Party can tell us when they please, though they also use them when they please for strong Arguments. However, in the present Case they do not quadrate. For.

\$ 15000 not 1

7 7. . 72

2. There is no Parallel between his Instances and our Lord's Commission. In those Acts of Men, the Commissions; Warrants, Patents, &c. are commonly regulated by flated Forms, and Precedents of some standing; which are therefore full. large, prolix, particular and express; so that from them every one who is concern'd, may learn his Duty and his Privilege: Yet, in them or some of them, as exact and plenary as they are, there is Room fometimes left for farther Enlargments or Explications, if not also for Retrenchments. How often do we hear of Supplemental Laws enacted on Purpose to make up Deficiencies in former Laws? And how often of new Orders and Instructions given by Governments, upon feveral Emergencies, to supply the Defects of the first Commissions? By Virtue of the New, the Commissioners are impowered to act beyond the Contents of the Old ones. Nay, and in those which are most perfect, there may be feveral Things relating to Circumstances and Ceremonials, which are not express'd. but are left to be understood by common Sense from the general Laws and current Customs in these Cases. For, the Law or Warrant is never defective for leaving out needless Things, which, in their kind, are necessary to be observ'd, though not express'd, fo long as in all Things dubious or unknown, it gives Directions. But,

4. Our Lord's Commission is exceeding short, giving Order only for the administring Baptism in the Name of the Holy Trinity, and for the Application of it to all Nations that should be converted. No doubt but he could express his Mind more fully and accurately than any Man on Earth, and he certainly did it as he intended. But was he bound to insert in a short Commission, all Things that we have need to know or do? Much less Things needless and superstuous, which his

Wisdom would not permit. If he said enough for his present Purpose, and for the Instruction of his Hearers, his Commission cannot be counted Defeclive or Imperfect, seeing he express'd all he had then in View. And what was this but to inform his Disciples. That Proselytism to Gospel Grace. which before was confin'd unto the Fews, must thenceforth be extended to all Nations? Therefore they must be preached unto to make them Converts. and then baptized. This was News to them; and needful to be given in Commission. But how they were to regulate their Doctrine, and order their Baptism towards Proselytes, in relation to their respective Ages, Capacities and Qualifi-cations, that they might learn from common Sense, and indeed knew it already by the Laws and Practice of their own Church in making Profelytes. So Christ did not intend to comprehend the whole Theory of Baptisin, nor all the Rules of its Practice in one short Expresfion, or two; but what he intended, that he express'd.

What a strange Fancy is it to imagine, that all the Rules about a prime Christian Ordinance should be crowded into one short Verse, and that this alone should be the only Rule, and only Commission to all the World, as Mr. Gale does? Has Christ left nothing for Wise Men to understand befides? No Room for farther Enlargements and Explications? Then are St. Paul's and St. Peter's farther Instructions about Baptism, utterly vain, needless and superfluous. As our Saviour spoke not all his Mind at once, John xvi. 12. fo were not all Parts of Scripture wrote at the fame Time, nor its Doctrines delivered intirely in a System, but as Occafions and Emergencies did require: And one Part of it makes up the apparent Deficiencies of other Parts. So that all together, it proves a complete Code of

Laws

Laws and Body of Divinity. Not, therefore, by Scraps and Parcels must we study them, but all intire, and compare Spiritual Things with Spiritual, if we will know the perfect Will of God. For the whole New Testament, with due Analogies from the Old, is our Warrant and Commission for Baptism, as it is likewise for all the Doctrines, and Practices we avow. If by any of those Mediums we justify Infant-Baptism, we gain our Point, and carry our Cause. For as former Laws and Customs in the like Cases, together with fresh Supplements and Instructions, are necessary Helps to regulate and understand Commissions among Men; so are all the Scripture Evidences concerning the Patriarchal Covenant, together with the Evangelical and Apostolical Instructions, to understand our Lord's Commission about Baptism.

Why then do our Adversaries cry out, We give up our Cause for ever, if we prove not Infant-Baptissin from that Commission? and where will we find it, if we find it not there? For is it not enough for us to find it in any Part of the Scripture that is still obligatory as our Rule? Or is it not sufficient if we can shew, that the Commission does not necessarily exclude it? For my own part, I have not endeavoured to prove it from the Commission, and yet if the Rules I have given before to understand the Commission aright, be good, it is there included. But,

7. Is Mr. Gale really resolved to stand by his own Principle, That the Commission is our only Rule, Warrant, or Authority? Or does he jest and banter with us? If the first, let us try how the Commission will answer his own Ends and Purposes. Where will he there find Baptisin with Water, since the Word Baptize does not necessarily imply it? For Christ baptized with another Baptisin of Fire and the Holy Ghost; and so did the Apostles, in effect, when at their laying on of Hands, the Holy

Ghost was commonly given. And if he cannot find that, how will he find out those celebrated Resemblances of Christ's and our Death, Burial and Refurrection, so much insisted upon for a certain End by Baptists? Or where will they find there the pre-requisite Conditions of Faith and Repentance, fince the Word pabilico, if it fignifies properly To teach, does not import them? For to teach fo, as to perfuade and make Converts, gives it a complex Idea, and is an Improvement on the native Simplicity of its Meaning. And our Lord and his Apostles taught many whom they could not make Disciples. Where also will they there find all the Doctrinals relating to the Benefits and Effects of Baptisin? As Regeneration, Illumination, Or were not these needful to be known and understood by Christians? Indeed, when People have imbibed these Notions from other Parts of Scripture, they may fancy that they see some of them at least in the Commission, and try by Reafoning to deduce them from it. But if they had not found them beforehand elsewhere, I am persuaded, they had never found them here, nor have been able to prove them to the World.

Or if this will not satisfy, let us go to the Institution of our Lord's Supper; His Command to celebrate it, is his Commission; and to this we are obliged to keep as closely as to that for Baptism. They were only the College of Apostles to whom he gave it, and bad them do the Actions that he did. If that then be our only Commission for that Sacrament, where in it shall we find a Warrant for communicating the Laity, Male or Female? No, we will demonstrate the contrary by the Rules in Use with the Mathematicians. The Commission of Christ must be punctually followed; neither more nor less must be done than he commanded. If there then we have not a Warrant to give his Sup-

per unto Laymen, we have it no where. But they were the Holy Apostles alone whom he commanded, Do this in Remembrance of me. At the same Time he commanded them also to take Bread, bless, break, and give it to one another, as he had done. Shall the Laity do all this? Yet all they must do, or none, for so runs the only Warrant and Commission. It was a Privilege therefore peculiar to the Apostles and Sacred Order, who alone were dignified therewith by their Lord, and distinguished from other Christians. The Laity are not qualified, because they cannot perform the Conditions by doing that which Christ had done. And this does as sufficiently and unavoidably exclude the Laity, as if it had been said expressly, The Laity are not to be communicated: Quod erat demonstrandum. I take this to be full as good a Demonstration as Mr. Gale's is against Infant-Baptism. For it goes upon the same Grounds, and concludes much in the same Terms. His Foundation is therefore fapped, and then the whole Superstructure falls of Courfe.

2. From the Scriptures not warranting Infant-Baptisin, he concludes on the Negative side against it, according to Tertullian's Maxim, Negat Scriptura quod non notat. But if by sound Consequence we can deduce it from the Scripture, the Thing is there, though not the Words. For the True Sense and Meaning of the Scripture, is Scripture. Such Consequences are allowed by our own, and other Churches, and in some Cases by the Baptists themselves; and it is by Consequences alone that they argue against baptizing Infants, and exclude them from their ancient Claim to Church Communion. Our Method is warranted by the Holy Ghost in citing Scripture. For how many Places of the Old Testament hath St. Paul quoted, which could prove his Point only by Consequence? And so our

Saviour proved the Refurrection of the Dead against the Sadducees. Nothing like the Word was in his Text, and the Sense lay so concealed there, that probably to this Day it had been undiscovered, had he not brought it to Light by his Omniscience. The Sadducees, it seems, were not so sagacious as some Men in our Days, to cavil and make Exceptions; else they had attempted something against his Proof, and not suffered themselves to be shamed and filenced. But the they faid nothing, and could fay nothing to the Purpole, yet had they still, like other Men, fome secret Reserves, which detained them in their Heterodoxy, though the Defeat they received, had forfeited their Reputation with the People. Christ and St. Paul were infallible in their Doctrines; but their Adversaries took them not for fuch, else their Word, without Proof, had been fufficient. 'Twas not their Inspiration that was regarded, but their Arguments; and to these also we refer ourselves without pretending to their Authority.

3. Coming close to the Point, Mr. Gale exerts his whole Energy, to prove, that Infants must not be baptized according to the Tenor of the Commission, which is the sole Rule and Authority, "even to the Holy Apostles themselves in this Matter." But it has been fully disproved already. And though he says, Judges are impowered and obliged to try and give Sentence in such and such Cases according to Law; yet not only the Statute Law, and the Words of their Commission, is their Rule, but Common Law, the Customs of their respective Courts, and the Precedents of Ruled Cases by former Judges, are allowed to be part of their Rule

and Law.

Out of the Commission he forms Two Propositions; "I. That the Words of it do necessarily ob-"lige to teach all whom they intend should be "baptized. And, 2. That this teaching must al"ways as necessarily precede their being baptized.

Both which Articles do very plainly exclude
Infants, because they are not capable of being

" taught at all, Lett. VII. p. 248, 249.

But if I am not greatly deceived, here is a Di-flinction without a Difference, these Two Propositions being co-incident; and he fays nothing new upon the latter, which he had not faid upon the former. Only Abundance of Words must be ramassed together to speak the same Thing over and over, that the Reader may be amused with Variety of Expressions, and artfully bewildred in a Labvrinth of Tautology. For the whole Account of the Demonstration issues in this; "That all People " must be taught before they are baptized, because " Christ's Ministers are commanded beforehand to " teach all that they do baptize. The Phrase is comprehensive, equally and universally applied " to all the Subjects of Baptisin without Distinction, " or Exception. They must teach all Nations, and baptize all Nations. If they do not teach them first, they must not baptize them; both or neither, all or none. For they are equally commanded to do the one as the other, and that to "the fame Persons indiscriminately. From " whence it inevitably follows, that Infants must not be baptized, because they cannot be taught."

This, as I conceive, is the Sum and Substance of all his Argumentation. Suspecting there might be some prosound Sense latent in his Words, which my shallow Understanding could not presently fathom, I read them over several Times: For he lays his whole Stress upon this Argument, and is professedly large, because it must serve instead of all the rest. At last, I concluded there is no secret Mystery in the Words, and no other Sense than what they present to the Reader's Mind at the

N 4

first

first View. Let him that desires farther Satisfaction, look into the Beginning of that Letter, and there, if he relishes Verbosity, and loves to see Identical Sentences diversified, he may have enough to gratify his Palate; but no more to satisfy his Judgment, than I have said. But now to take off its Force:

1. The whole Argument is grounded on a false Bottom, and palpable Absurdity. For it supposes, that the Commission expressly contains the whole Will of our Lord about Baptism; when his only Meaning in it, was to inform his Ministers, that Proselytisin to his Religion is not to be limitted to the Fews, but extended to all Nations; unto whom the Gospel must be first preached, and then Baptism administred in the Name of the Eternal Trinity. But Mr. Gale stakes us down immoveably to the ffrict Words and Limits of the Commission, being not content to tell us, that all must be done that is therein contained, which we freely grant; but also, that nothing more must be done, which we stiffly deny. For why should this be the Law in the present Injunction, any more than in others of the like Nature? The Institution of our Lord's Supper ought to be as compleat and finished, as this Order concerning Baptism; and the Weakness of arguing after this Manner upon that Topic, 1 have shewed before. Nor will it be amiss to prosecute it a little farther.

For if in the Commission for Baptisin St. Matthew must be taken apart from all the other Scriptures, and be closely followed exclusively of them; we may as well follow any one of the Evangelists, in his Accounts of the Lord's Supper, exclusively to the rest. As St. Luke represents the Injunction, there is no mention made of Eating the Bread, and Drinking the Cup; Therefore, according to the Modern way of Reasoning, those Actions ought to be omitted.

omitted, because not commanded at the Institution. St. Matthew and St. Mark speak not a Word of receiving that Sacrament in Remembrance of Christ. Therefore in that Ordinance we must not commemorate our Saviour's Passion, because it is not ordered in the Commission.

And even in this present Commission for Baptism, Water, Faith and Repentance are not expressed, and, as I think, are not necessarily understood by Implication. We must then lay them aside as uncommanded, unless we be allowed to seek for them elsewhere. But if this be the Rule, why should not the other Evangelists be followed, as well as St. Matthew? St. Luke omits the Commission. St. Mark, from Christ's Mouth, makes Faith and Baptism the Conditions of Salvation, but does not instruct us in whose Name the Baptisin should be administred. From St. John we learn, that Christ's Disciples did baptize; but he omits the Commission, with the Ages, Sexes and Qualifications of the Persons that were, or should be baptized. And yet he says, that he had given us Light enough to form a saving Faith by his sacred History and Instructions, Fohn xx. 31.

By these Things we understand, that Christ's Commissions and Commands did not always run in such a Strict and Precise Form of Words, as those of Men use to do: Or, at least, that the Evangelists wrote not by settled Precedents, but took the Freedom to express their Saviour's Will in different Forms and Words, as they judged convenient. From all together, and from other inspired Writers, must we form our Notions, and learn the Pleasure of our God. But if we rigidly insist on the Words of a single Writer, or single Passage, in Exclusion to the rest, we mangle the Word of God, and shall very deservedly for our Pains embrace

and patronize Error instead of Truth.

2. Mr. Gale tells us; " Our Lord does not fay, "Ye shall baptize the whole Nation, or every "Person of every Nation, or all of all Nations, which would have made the Case very different " from what it is; but only indefinitely, all " Nations. Scarce a Youngster, who has begun his Logick, but he is acquainted with the Distinction between genera singulorum, and singula generum. So the only Meaning is, that the Gospel should be preach'd to all other Nations, as before it was to the fews; and that they " should be baptiz'd, if willing and capable. Why, then, all Nations are taught when the Adult are taught; for that is the genera singulorum: And so there is no need of teaching Infants to Inlfil our Saviour's Precept, because they are comprehended in the Genus. And so are all Cities, Towns and Families taught, when the Heads and Adult therein are taught. For Infants and all those that cannot act for themselves, are included in the Principals, and determined by their Actions. So the Chiefs acting for them, and reprefenting them, they may, under their Covert, receive the Benefit of being baptiz'd.

But then they must not be baptiz'd, unless they are personally taught; for none beside those that are first taught in Person, shall be baptiz'd. This I deny, because they are accounted as taught and converted in their Heads, as the Species in the Genus. But they are not so accounted as baptiz'd, because this must needs be a Personal Act; else there is no need of baptizing them at all when they come of Age. If this Doctrine seems strange at first hearing, the Strangeness may cease, when it appears to be the Law and Practice of God and

Men.

Among Men, if Foreigners be naturaliz'd, they are bound to the Duties and Services requir'd of natural Subjects by the Municipal Laws, as they enjoy their Privileges. The Conditions impos'd at their Admittance they must actually submit unto, and in Person too, if that be demanded, before they can receive the Benefit. But not so their Infants and Minors, because the Law construes it as done by their Parents in their Name and Behalf; and yet are they Joint-partakers of the Privileges. Suppose it should be one Condition, that those who are to be naturaliz'd, must, before their Admission into the Body Politick, be competently instructed in the Laws and Customs of the Nation; never would any wife and equitable Judges interpret this to the Exclusion of Infants, because they cannot be so taught; except the Case had been particularly specified to that Purpose by the Legislature. For it is a hard Case, and contrary to the known and approved Usages in that Affair. But it would be determined to answer the End of the Law, if the Parents were instructed, and Engagement made for the Infants to be in due Time. Yet, if there was, without Exception, a Sum of Money for every Body to pay down before-hand for his Naturalization, the Parents might do it in the Infants Name, and the Law would impute it as their Act. Or if some Ceremony was necessary to be used for that. End, this also might be transacted by others upon their Persons, and in their Behalf: And it would receive the fame Construction.

It is needless to exemplify this farther in Matters belonging to Corporations and Charter Acts: For the same Laws and Customs would hold there. After the same Manner may Infants be admitted into the Church and its Privileges by Baptisin, which is a necessary Rite for that Purpose; for we know no other Door of Entrance, or visible Rite of Admission thither.

Against

Against these Methods observed by Men, there is no Room to except, because God hath approved and justified them by his own Acts. For so were Infants incorporated into the Church from Abraham's Time by his appointed Ordinance; which the Apostles knew very well; and therefore in that Sense it was natural for them to understand the Commission of their Lord.

2. Either Infants are included in the Commission for Baptisin, or they are not. Our Adversaries strenuously contend for the Negative, and affirm, that it includes and concerns the Adult only, who can be taught. If fo, this Commission makes nothing at all for or against their Baptism of Infants, because they are no ways concern'd in it. Our Saviour had them not then in his Mind or Thoughts. but spoke only of Adult Persons. For, how shall we know his Thoughts, but by his Words? And yet his Words do not mention Infants. So their Right to Baptism may still be safe enough on other Foundations. And most unreasonable are the Baptists in applying this Commission to them, or interpreting it to their Exclusion, when they acknowledge it means them not, but another fort of Persons that are very different; and within these Bounds it must be punctually circumscrib'd.

What is it then but a Particular Proposition, not an Universal? What but a definite and limitted Rule, relating to certain Persons so and so qualified, not an indefinite, relating to all, without Exception? "I'm sure to argue thus "from a Particular, to a General, is an Er-"ror in Logick, says Mr. Stennett, Ch. x. p. "207." Is this Consequence therefore good? All Adult Persons must be first taught, or they shall not be baptized; but Infants cannot be taught, therefore they shall not be baptized. No, the Mathematical Demonstration, is a poor Sophism, which

which there is scarce a Youngster in Logic, but can easily detect it. Such a Proposition as this, we demand for our Conviction: No Person at all shall be baptized, unless he be taught beforehand. and professes his Faith and Repentance: Or thus, Whosoever will be baptiz'd, he must be first taught to believe, and repent. Of this kind is not the Commission, but is wholly restrained to the Adult, as our Antagonists say. Nor is there any Proposition equivalent to it in the whole Gospel. And therefore, instead of Logic and Demonstration, they shall not palm upon us manifest Shams and Fallacies.

That Adult Persons must have previous Instructions, and make Profession of Faith and Repentance before Baptism, no considerate Man, will ever deny. It has been always the Doctrine and Practice of Padobaptists. Against whom, then, do the Antipadobaptists dispute, when they frame Arguments, and alledge Instances from Scripture and Antiquity, to prove the Point? They only fight with their own Shadows, but do not at all oppose their Adversaries. Could they produce a thousand Proofs to that purpose, they speak not a Word in prejudice to our Cause, but only prove, what we own and affirm, teach and practife, as well as they. Yet, the Scripture Instances and Allegations, in which these Con-ditions for Baptism are required, do all confessedly belong and relate to Adult Persons. And if so. what Weakness or Perverseness is it to make any Mention of them in this Controversy? And of the fame kind are those which are fetch'd from Church Antiquity. We may see a Specimen of it in Mr. Gale's Citation of St. Ferom. "They first teach "all the Nations: Then when they are taught, " they baptize them with Water; for it cannot be " that the Body should receive the Sacrament of " Baptism,

"Baptism, unless the Soul have before received the true Faith." So says that Father. But does he not mean it of Adult Persons? Or dares Mr. Gale challenge him therefore for an Antipadobaptist? No question but he would, had St. Ferom liv'd about Tertullian's Time. Just so some of the Baptists represent our Church, as demanding in her Catechism actual Faith and Repentance in all Persons, before Baptism, and make her feloniously to destroy her felf, by practising contrary to her Doctrine in Padobaptism.

4. Particular Propositions limitted to certain Persons, can then only be applied and accommodated to other Persons, when their Case is parallel, or when there is a Parity of Reason to justify the Application. But is it so between the Adult and Infants, that they should be equally ty'd to the fame Conditions before they shall enjoy their ancient Privilege of Incorporation with God's Church? Who cannot presently see the great Disparity of their

State?

For, 1. The Adult are capable of actual Faith and Repentance, but not to Infants in their pre-

fent Condition.

2. If the Adult believe not the Gospel, when it is propos'd to them in its clearest Evidences for Conviction, they are stubborn and contuma-cious in their Infidelity, and therefore hopeless. A positive Act or Habit of Disbelief they have, which is contrary to Faith, and utterly incapacitates them for Gospel Grace. Whereas, Infants. are purely passive in the Case, and not active, like the others, in Unbelief. As they do not actually believe, so neither do they disbelieve. Having therefore no Habit, nor Act of obstinate Disbelief in their Hearts, there is all just Presumption on their side, that they will be educated in Faith and Piety, as the Children of Believers and Profelytes

felytes us'd to be. So their Case is widely different from that of Adult Persons, and they ought not,

in Reason, be oblig'd to the same Measures.

Should we shew the like Rigors towards them in other Matters, they must be starv'd out of the World, because they cannot work; For, he that will not work, neither should be eat : And be held irremediably damn'd, because, we read, He that believeth not, is damned: And, Except ye repent, ve shall all likewise perish. But, as common Equity teaches our Adversaries to exempt Infants from these hard Laws, and restrain them to the Adult : fo should the same Equity teach them also to exempt them from the Conditions required in the Adult for Baptisin. For, in Reason, they ought no more be refused their ancient Privilege of Church Communion for want of Faith and Repentance, than be counted damned for the same Want, or be starv'd because they do not work; fince it is no less necessary to be a Christian, than it is to eat and drink. Equity therefore, and not Rigor, should interpret Scripture in Favour to their Claims.

After this, Mr. Gale, in a pompous Train of Quotations from all forts of Authors, prepares to demonstrate, that undifferent, fignifies to teach, or to make Disciples by Teaching and Instruction; which is not competible with the State of Insants, who ought not therefore, to be baptized. His Design is levell'd against Doctor Hammond, Mr. Wall, and others of our Church, who hold that undifferent, may signify to make Disciples by the Right of Baptism, without any previous Teaching or Instruction. It think it needless to wade into this verbal Controversy, but shall satisfy myself, and I hope all impartial Judges, with an obvious Remark upon

the Matter.

There have been in the Church of God, at least from Abraham's Time, two Sorts of Disciples; those that are initial and incomplete, and those that are full and perfect. The first have been always made by an External Rite or Ordinance; the others not only by that, but by Instructions also joyned therewith, to which, their inward Qualifications were suppos'd to answer. The first are no less truly and properly to be call'd Disciples, than the others, though not in such a complete Sense: As an Infant is as truly and properly a Rational Creature, though he cannot reason, as a Man of Years who has the Faculty of Reasoning in Perfection. And so, in the initial Sense, Infants may also be counted Disciples, or mabilai, and mabilion, actively taken to make them fo, as madificuous,

passively, to be Disciples.

That this Account is true, will appear from the common Sense and Customs of the World in that Affair. Scholar and Disciple are but two Words for the fame Thing. Suppose a Child be entred into a School by his Parents, and admitted by the Master: with a Defign of being taught; he is, from that very Minute, his Scholar, though he has not as yet learned a Letter of his Book in that School, or from that Master. For the bare Acts of Entrance on the one fide, and of Admittance on the other, give the Name of Scholar effectually to the Child. The Compact and Agreement is past, and that founds the Right and Relation between the Parties concern'd. And the Intention of learning, and being taught, serves for the Act, till the proper Time for Performance is come. And so it is with a Scholar in the University: The Name is entred into the Books, the Tutor is chosen, and all the Formalities are transacted; he is thenceforth a Scholar of that College where he is entred, and a Member of the University, though he presently goes

goes into the Country, and does not come for a while to study there, and, perhaps, never, being hindred by some Casualties intervening. I take this to be Matter of Fact, and therefore undeniable. So it certainly was with circumcis'd Infants in the Church of God before Christ's Time, and so it may be fince. Bare Admission into his Church by Baptisin is sufficient to make and denominate Infants his Disciples. For that alone will ground their Relation to him as their Master, and brings them . under Engagement to perform Covenants. And if this be the common Sense and Usage of Mankind in such Cases, it signifies little to ramass a Heap of Authorities to prove another Notion of Disciple-ship, since the one may be true, and not contradict the other.

Many of Mr. Gale's Authors may be challeng'd from him, and the Construction he gives them, be fairly disputed. Nay, and several of them must be, by Reason they were profes'd Padobaptists, both Ancient and Modern. For if they allow of no other Sense of washistow, than to make Disciples by teaching, how came they to allow and practise Infant Baptisin, which makes Disciples without teaching? If so, they must contradict themselves.

and their Authority is of no Force.

Beside, it must be observed, that Historians, Biographers, and such Writers, giving Account of Passages sully transacted, must take Disciples, in the most sull and perfect Sense of the Word, for Persons that have gone through with their Studies in their respective Schools; and not for bare Beginners, that have just given in their Names to their several Masters. That, therefore, presents us with the sull Idea, or completest Notion of the Word. whereas had they accounted only for their Entrance and Admission into the Schools, I am persuaded, they had never resuled to give them the Name of Disciples

Disciples upon that Act alone. But as they had a quite different Thing in View, so they must give a different Account.

And farther yet; this was most natural and necessary for them to do, unless they had a Mind to trifle and play the Fools. For, if Authors intend to give Accounts and Descriptions, whence should they borrow their Characters of Things or Persons, but from the most persect in the kind? As for Instance, If a Man were to describe a Person of the Human Species, would he take his Characters from an Embryo or Instant, because he is of that Species? And not rather from a Man, who is persect in his Kind? How silly and ridiculous would that be? So truly must Wise Men account for the Name of a Disciple, taking him in the complete Sense; and yet no more deny a baptized Instant to be a Disciple, than they deny an Instant to be of the Human Species, when they describe a Man.

If thus the Matter stands, Mr. Gale's Travails do prove abortive, and will never conclude his Point. For the Thing incumbent on him to shew, was not, that Disciple-ship, in its perfect Notion, includes Learning, or being taught; but that there can be no such a Notion as an initial or incomplete Disciple; and that his Authors did really mean to exclude and deny it in their Accounts. Then might he have spar'd his laborious Pains to prove the other Notion, in which he could meet with no Opponents.

We have now seen in what Sense it was natural for our Lord's Ministers, being of a Jewish Extract and Education, to understand his Commission. We have seen, that his Command for Proselytism and Baptism in St. Matthew, is not our whole Commission or Warrant for those Matters, but the whole Word of God that concerns the Evangelical Covenant. We

have

have feen, that the Conditions of Baptism must be confined only to the Adult, and do not concern Infants. And we have feen that Disciple-ship may include them in its Notion, as well as the others. But what has Mr. Gale proved? That Adult Perfons must be taught before they be baptized, and nothing else. Here we agree, and so far he shall have his Argument, and carry his Cause.

3. Some alledge Mark xvi. 16. against Infant-Baptism: He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be faved. "There Faith goes before Baptism, as "the Condition requisite to receive it. Infants, "therefore, wanting Faith, must not be baptized, because they cannot perform the Condition."

" because they cannot perform the Condition.

But the Scripture is not always so curious in its Style, as to place those Things first, which must go first in the Order of Time; else this Absurdity would follow, that People must repent before they believe, because the Words are so placed, Mar. i. 15. Alls xx. 21. Again, it is not true, that Faith is there made the Condition of Baptisin, but both Faith and Baptism are made the Conditions of Salvation. And therefore, it might be argued from thence more agreeably to the Letter of the Text, that Infants cannot be faved without Faith, than that they cannot be baptized without it. But fince, to avoid this Stroke, the Baptists acknowledge the Words to mean only the Adult, the Answer is given already. And so it is to all their Allegations out of the Ass. of the Apostles, because they confess all those were Adult Persons, of whom Faith was required in order to Baptism. Thus have I said enough, if not too much, to their Demands of Faith and Instruction in all the Candidates for that Sacrament. But,

4. Their Demand of Repentance in them all for that End, is still more unreasonable. Only once in Scripture is that required as a Condition antecedent

Q 2

unto Baptisin in those that would be Christ's Difciples, Ads ii. 38. And then it was required only of Persons arrived to Maturity of Years, who had fignalized and diffinguished themselves for atrocious Guilt, in murdering the Just One, and crucifying the Lord of Glory. Set the Infants of Christian Parents on the same Level with those murderous Fews, and then require of them the same Repentance to make them Christians. Actual Sin they never committed against God, nor should they therefore be bound to actual Repentance. And as Adam's Transgression was derived, or imputed unto them, without their own Act, or personal Fault, fo may Christ's Merits be applied to their Souls for Grace and Pardon in Christian Baptism, without actual Faith of their own. Passive they wholly are in the Imputation of that Sin, and passive they are in receiving Pardon. John baptized with the Baptisin of Repentance, and required Confession of Sins, and Faith in Him that was to come after him. But Christ he received to Baptism, though he had no Sin to confess and repent of, and no future Messias to believe in. This shews, that the Conditions of Baptism are only demanded where they are necessary, and that Baptism may be duly administred, where all the Ends and Benefits of it are not attainable.

For their Innocence and Simplicity, Christ proposes little Children as Patterns of Conversion to the World, Matt. xviii. 3. But the Copy needs not transcend the Original, nor the Exemplification be more perfect than the Example. It is sufficient therefore, for Adult Persons to be qualified for Baptism and God's Kingdom, as their Patterns are. And so Infants, without Repentance, are altogether as well prepared for Baptismal Grace, as others can be with it. From whence we firmly conclude,

that

that their want of Repentance is no manner of Hin-

drance to their Baptism.

After all, we will suppose, but not grant, that Instruction, Faith and Repentance were Conditions indispensibly required before Baptisin; yet what Reason can be given, why Infants may not submit unto, or take upon them those Conditions, as well as they could undertake a Ministerial Charge and Office in God's House? If no Reason can be assigned for it, we thus justify the Assumption: Moses speaking of the Kobathites, Num. iii. 28. says; In the Number of all the Males, from a Month Old and upwards, were Eight thousand and six hundred keeping the Charge of the Sanctuary. That Children of a Month Old were Infants, cannot be denied; nor that the Sanctuary was God's House. There it is expresly said, that they kept a Charge; which was a Ministerial Office imposed on the Kobathites by the Divine Law. If Infants therefore kept that Charge, they were Ministers in God's House, and their Charge and Ministration lasted about Fifteen or Sixteen Centuries. So the Matter of Fact is proved from the Scripture.

Against this it will be pleaded, "That the In"fants did not personally keep the Charge, because
"none were to officiate in the Sanctuary before
"they were 30 Years Old. Others, therefore, did
"the whole Duty, and their Ministrations were
"accepted in the Infants Name and Stead." This
is true; but we dispute not about the Manner, so
long as the Thing itself must be allowed. For the
Charge was imposed on the whole Family of Males,
from a Month old and upwards, and that Charge
they kept; the Service of those that were qualified
to act, being imputed to all, and accepted for
the rest. Even so, if it had pleased God to lay the
Duties of Faith and Repentance on all Persons that
should be baptized, the actual Personnance need

not lie on Infants by reason of their Incapacity; but a Vicarious Discharge of it by Parents and Friends, would serve the Turn. These may ingage for their Christian Education in Faith and Piety, 'till they come of Age. And this will justify our Church in baptizing Infants, upon the Engagements of Sponfors and Sureties in their behalf.

But it may be farther pleaded, "That the Levi-" tical Services about the Sanctuary, confifted in "corporal Acts, which might be conveniently "done by Deputies and Substitutes. But Learning " the Will of God, Faith and Repentance, are Moral and Intellectual Acts, which every one must dif-" charge in Person, or they will not be accepted." To this I answer, That the Sanctuary was the most Holy Place in the Tabernacle, where God dwell'd between the Cherubims, and from whence he gave his Oracles and Responses. Therefore, were Awe. Reverence, Fear and inward Adoration due to God from All that officiated in his Presence. Also a just Proportion of Respect and Reverence was payable to the Sanctuary itself, with its sacred Furniture. The Congregation that stood at a greater Distance off, must vet reverence God's Sanctuary, Levixix. 30. Much more those Ministers that approached to officiate in his Sight, and to bear their Charge. For, so great was the Awe and Regard the Kohathites must bear to the sacred Utenfils which they carried covered on their Shoulders, that they must not touch them, lest they die, Num. iv. 15. Now these inward Adorations and Acts of Reverence, were no less Moral and Intellectual Duties, or Acts of the Mind and Understanding, than Learning, Faith and Repentance are. And, consequently, if those Acts belonged to the Charge of Infants, and God accepted of a Vicarious Performance in their Stead. the fame he may do in the Conditions of Baptism.

We know, Christ accepted of the Faith of Parents for their fick Children, and of Friends for diseased Persons, that were necessarily absent, to vouchfafe them the Favour of Bodily Cures. And we trust, that God is not more Merciful to Bodies than to Souls, but passes the same gracious Construction on his Peoples Actions in both Cases, where he sees the same Reason and Necessity. No new and unprecedented Doctrine do we here deliver, but what has been frequently warranted by God's Procedure with the Fews: And this, in Matters that were more difficult and remote from Grace. For, how often did he pardon the Murmurs and Rebellions of that whole Nation for the fake of Abrabam and their Fathers, who had been dead long before? And if his Mercy extended fo far to wilful Sinners, upon the bare Motive and Confideration of their Predecessors Piety; it can be no strange or groundless Divinity, to hold, that he will befriend harmless Infants for the fake of their religious Parents, feeing his Mercy reaches to a Thousand Generations in them that love bim. This, if possible, should put the Impudence of certain Writers to the Blush, who are not ashamed to publish it before the World, that Infants cannot be the better for their Parents Piety, nor receive any Benefit to their Souls on its Account.

What more can be urged against this, I am not aware; but he it what it will, I do suppose it ca-

pable of a fair Reply.

And so have I gone thro' with my Vindication of Infant-Baptism from God's Word, and have endeavoured to prove the Lawfulness of it, and to take off our Adversaries Objections against it, which I thought to be of any Moment and Importance. What Satisfaction it will give the Reader, I know not, but am sure, I have managed it with the utmost Fidelity in my Power, and have advanced

nothing but what I believe in my Heart to be the Truth. To God's Blessing I therefore leave the Issue, and shall only beg Leave to make a few further Remarks on Mr. Gale's wary Conduct in this

Affair, before I conclude.

In his Pursuits of Mr. Wall, he very prudently stopped his Course at St. Cyprian's Door; because he taw the Evidences then against him for Infant-Baptism, were too strong and bright to be contradicted. From thenceforth he gives up the Cause, though not without some few Exceptions. "For, " as he imagines, the rest of the Church beside " the africans, did not so soon strike in with the " grand Innovation, and submit to baptize their " Infants." But in taking his Leave, he passes his Compliments on those Southern Nations, and gives their Character; "That the Africans were" Men generally more of That of the Africans were Men generally weak of Understanding, Let. " XIII. p. 529. And though their Bishops were " no wifer than to admit the Error, perhaps, only as an indifferent Thing, or in Cases of Danger, " the Greek Churches feem very plainly to have " been still of another Opinion." Also to shew that he can master Paradoxes; he tells us in the Sequel, "That the Piety and Zeal of the Ancients; was fo " far from being a Security against this Innova-"tion, that, in Reality, it tended very much to be-tray them into it." To this Effect are his Words. But then,

1. If Piety and Zeal do really betray into Error, and this too of that pernicious Confequence, as to leave to the Christian World neither a True Church, Ministry, nor Sacraments, what dangerous and traiterous Things must Zeal and Piety be? Must we then be Prophane and Cold, that we may be Safe? Yet was it Christ's Judgment, that True Piety was the best Expedient to know the Truth, John vii. 17. and Chap xiv. 21. And so was Solomon's.

mon's, Prov. xxviii. 5. As St. Paul fays, on the other fide, That a Pleasure in Unrighteousness is the way to be betrayed into Lies, strong Delusions, and damnable Errors, 2 Thest. ii. 10, 5°c. Let who will, or can therefore believe Mr. Gale in this Particular. But it by Piety and Zeal, he means Folly and Superstition, or some Passionate Heats and Transports of that Nature in the Ancients, we must crave his Pardon, if we diffent from that Account.

2. When he fays, "That Infant-Baptisin was ad-" mitted at first, perhaps, only as a Thing indiffe-"rent, or in Cases of Danger;" I suppose, the Perbaps was foisted in to fave the Credit and the Conscience, but is insufficient to do either. For he knows the contrary very well, and owns, that they made it necessary, by a Mistake of John iii. 5. as he informs us. St. Cyprian's Epistle to Fidus would alone instruct him, that they counted it not as a Thing indifferent. Or, if they had done so, Mr. Gale and his Party, who make such a Stir about it, as a necessary Cause of Separation, would never pass their Accounts. And he knows, that the Cases of Danger introduced the Aspersion or Persusion of Clinics, as St. Cyprian expresses it, Epist. ad Magnum; Not the Baptizing of Infants. Either, therefore, their Admission of the Error must be a Proof of their great Weakness, or the Perhaps is an Argument of our Author's great Wariness.

3. His characterizing the Africans, "That they were generally Men of weak Understandings, and that the Bishops were no wiser than to admit the Error;" falls in with the common Observation and Practice; That the Evidences against us must be disgraced. He thinks Mr. Wall deserved Animadversion for taking too much Liberty with Tertullian, who, for a well-known Reason, is a favourite Author with the Antipadobaptists. But he cannot say, that Mr. Wall wronged him, since he is,

for some Centuries, the most exceptionable Church-Writer of all the Africans. Yet was Tertullian but a single Man; whereas Mr. Gale may, with a good Grace, traduce the whole Body of the Africans in general, as Fools and Fathers of Falshoods, which is the true English of his Words, because they patronized a Practice that he dislikes. And

this we mult take for Candor and Impartiality!

But whether the Africans in general had fuch weak Heads, and the Bishops no more. Wisdom, than to corrupt the Church with mischievous Errors, let their Writings, which are still extant, testify. They shine much too brightly in Ecclesiastical History, and in the Eye of the Learn, ed World, for to need an Apology. That Conference alone, which was managed between the Catholics and the Donatists under Marcellinus, vindicates them sufficiently from this Reproach, and shews, that the Africans wanted not for Subtlety and Acuteness. And while the Old Romans were ingaged in Wars with those Nations, whatever Cause they had to complain of the Punic Faith, they found no Cause to insult over the Punic Folly. Or, if some Errors may be proved on the Africans in those Days, I hope this does not quite destroy their Credit, and place them in the same Class with the Fabulous Rabbies. Elfe, how can other Bishops and Churches escape? And; particularly, how can the beloved Tertullian maintain his Credit, and come off with flying Colours?

4. When our Author fays, "That the Greek Churches "feem plainly to have been still of another Opinion," he cites Dionysius, the illustrious Bishop of Alexandria, on his side, in this Passage concerning Novatian: "He ut terly disallows of Holy Baptism, and subverts the Faith and Profession which goes before it:" Then he adds a little after; "It is impossible a Man who never dreamed of Infant Baptism, should speak more plainly against it: Nor can we expect to find any Passages more.

" inconfiftent with that Practice, than this is. "

Low Water indeed it must then be with the Antipado-baptists, for such Testimonies and Authorities. For, can he not find a plainer Passage to his Purpose in our Church Catechi'm, not to speak of our best Divines, and yet we are not against Infant Baptism? I do not believe that illustrious Bishop dreamed at all while he was Writing; yet living not very far from Africa, where St. Cyprian, with 66 Bishops, had in a Synod established Infant Bap-

219

tism, he must be rather ignorant than illustrious, if he knew nothing of that Matter. Or if the News at last reached his Ears, he and others could not but be strangely surprized at the Boldness of those few Bishops, in Comparison, who without consulting foreign Churches, ventured to settle a wicked Innovation, contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholic Church, to our Lord's Commission,

and to the Laws and Usage of the Apostles. 11 1

According to Mr. Gale, the Rife of Padebaptism in Africa. must be fixed about the Beginning of the Third Century. For an Attempt was made by some to introduce it in Tertullian's Time, against which he made a Vigorous Stand, but was not able to stem the Tide. He, indeed, strenu-ously opposed it with his Otilior est, which, in our Author's Sense, we must render Unlawful. But notwithstanding the Strenuous Opposition, it broke in upon the African Church before St. Cyprian's Time, and under him got Synodical Establishment: Other Churches, and especially the Greek, were not yet infected with the Error. But, however, as Errors are contagious, it crept in gradually among them also, 'till at length it over ran the Christian World, to the incredible Detriment of Religion. For the Wife Afiatics and Europeans had yet no more either of Wisdom or Honesty, than to imitate the Foolish Africans, and permit them to impose their novel and pernicious Error on their Understandings; and that too under the Pretext of Apostolical Antiquity and Tradition. For it had no more Modesty than to make this impudent Claim in St. Austin's Time, and before that, if the interpolated Origen might be heeded. Nor had any Christian in the whole Church, Orthodox or Heretic, Catholic or Schismatic, the Courage and Integrity to make the least Opposition to its Encroachments, except the brave Tertullian, who, bearing a mortal Hatred to all Errors and Innovations, endeavoured, though without Success, to stifle it in its Cradle. For Nazianzen's ineaking Advice for Three or Four Years Delay, and this with Exception also, came in too late, the Error having then struck too strong a Root for such a feeble-Hand to pluck it up. This is my Descant on Mr. Gale's Account, concerning the Rife and Progress of Padobaptism.

But let our Adversaries say what they please, neither Tertullian nor Nazianzen attempted to extirpate it with that masculine Vigor which became the Champions of the Truth, by dressing it out in the proper Colours of

Sin and Unlawfulness; but they rested in the bare Plea of Inexpediency. A Criminal Act against Christ's Commisfion, and a Mock-Baptism, which, if it had its Coarte, would foon unchurch the Christian World, they should have called it, in case they had been so wife and zeasous as our present antipadobaptists. An Anathematicey should have pronounced against its Abertors; and, it they would not be reformed, they should have ut erry broke out Communion with them. But Terrullian's African Wit and Smartness in exposing the Teners ne did not like, and Nazianzen's florid Vein of Oratory, intirely faired them here. Thus dodging and dallying where their main Energy should have beeen exerted, they only thruck at the Branches to trim it a little, but left the Koot and Stem in the Ground untouch'd, which, in spite of their faint Attempts, that forth and fluorish'd like the Stunip of the Tree in Nebuchadnezzar's Vision. All this while the universal Church beside, were in a Lethargic Sleep, tamely admitting the corrupt Practice as an indifferent thing, and little dreaming, that it would unchurch Posterity, and fo prove fatal to their Religion. For, in the Fourth Century, at farthest, it grew up to be an Epidemical Dilease, that overspreaded the Church; and the Christian World might groan to fee itself so suddenly turn'd into Pabobaptist. Other Errors and Innovations of leffer Note they could ffrenuously oppose with a becoming Zeal and Piety; but here, their Zeal and Piety themselves play'd the Traytors, with them, and help'd to fascinate them into Delusion!

This Account is incredible enough in itself; but if, not-withstanding that, true it must be with our Antagonists, I would gladly be resolved in one Difficulty, which seems to me unsurmountable; and which Mr. Gale, for a Reason he knows best, and we may guess at, has left altogether unattempted. For, it is well known, that St. Austin, towards the End of the Fourth Century, affirmed, That the universal Church had always held and retained Insant Baptism, as a Thing that was delivered and handed down unto it by Apostolical Authority, De Bapt. cont. Donat. 1. 4. ad sin. Again, after the Beginning of the next Century, in his Book De Nat, & Grat. c. 6. he says; "That to his "Remembrance, he never heard any other thing from any "Christian that believed the Scriptures, whether he were

"Catholic, Heretic, or Schifmatic; but they all held,
that in Christ's Church, from the Time it was founded,

"Infants were baptized for the Remission of Sin. And he believes St. Jerom, with all his Reading and Learning, could find no otherwise. And, as St. Austin has recorded it, Pelagius himself affirms, that he never had heard, even any impious Heretic or Schismatic, that would say, Infants should not be baptiz'd in order to Salvation; and none so ignorant of the Scripture, that he would in the

Here is a bold Appeal made to the Christian World for the Apostolical Antiquity and Universal Practice of Infant Paptism. St. Austin, St. Jerom, Pelagius; Catholics, Here ics and Schismarics, were all agreed, and subscribed to that as true. Lid it then begin in Africa, St. Austin's Country, but Two hundred Years before, at most, and not in other Places, 'till fome confiderable Time after that? If this be to, how could Sr. Auffin and all Christendom be ignorant of its Original? Could he not look Two Centuries backward, into the Hittory of his own Church and Nation, to inform himself better about Matter of Fact; and not take the L berty to write in the Dark, and talk at Random, to the Shame of his Face, if he published a Falshood, and provoke the World to prove him a Lyar? But that he was no Novice in Greek and Latin Antiquities, his Learned Book De Civitate Dei, is alone sufficient Evidence. And that he was competently skill'd in Church History, his Tract of Herefies bears Witness. Among which Herefies, neither he nor Epiphanius, nor Theodoret, nor Phi aftriw, nor any Ecclefiaftical Writers of those Times, could meet with the ancient, universal and longliv'd Herefy of the Anipadobapiifts. For, had they found it in any old Author, as Mr. Gale fancies that he has done, it is most probable, that all, or some of them, had inserted it among Errors and Herefies, fince the Practice of Infant-Baptifni was then thought necessary to Salvation.

But all this while, where were the Wits of his acute and sub le Adversaries the *Pelagians*, when they suffered him to impose on their Understandings such a gross and notoricus Falshood, to the great Prejudice of their Cause? To Original Sin they were declared Enemies, and that the Universal Church of Christ always baptized Insants for the Remission of that Sin, was St. Austin's and the Catholics Plea against their Herefy; yet, to the constant and universal Practice of the Church, in baptizing Insants, the *Pelagians* gave Assent, because they found it a manifest

Truth:

Truth; but the End, which was Remission of Sin, they denied, and substituted another in its Room. But their easiest, shortest, and most effectual Method to defend their Error, had been to deny the Matter of Fact about Infant-Baptism, and traduce it for a Novel and Corrupt Practice: And so, doubtless, they would have done, in case they could for Fear and Shame. Opportunities and Advantages enough they had for Information, with Heads that were cunning and inquisitive. Throughout the most famous and eminent Parts of Christendom, they made their Travels. Their Residence they took up in Capital Cities, where was the greatest Confluence of all forts of People. And with the most knowing and learned Christians, Greeks and Latins they were very conversant. Yet still could they meet with never a Person, and never a Book, that would difabufe them, and give them better Intelligence concerning the Antiquity and Universality of Padobaptism, which the Catholics pressed them with to overthrow their Error. So that they were forced to acquiesce in that Opinion, and shift as they could for another Answer to their Adversaries

main Argument against them.

Or, was the whole Church itself really ignorant of the late Innovation, that was every where introduced among Christian People in the Article of Infant Baptism? And could St. Aust in face them down with a naked Untruth in a Case so very plain? Not above Two Centuries backward had it begun to be practis'd in foolish Africa! Not above One, or thereabout, in other Churches, when the Doctrine and Practice of the Universal Church, as well as the Authority of the Scripture, had been wholly against it all the Time before. Could it then steal in without their Knowledge, while all Eyes were fast asleep? For plain Matter of Fact it was, that concern'd every Christian Soul; an open and publick Practice in all their Congregations. Every Man and Woman among them must therefore, in their Time, be sensible of the manifest Change and Alteration which they faw with their Eyes, if they could but diffinguish between an Infant and an Adult Person. And when St. Austin wrote, the Change had been made in the Days of their next, or not far distant Predecessors. Short Memories, wretched Understandings, and poor Records, they must all have, if such a Change as this could be so soon, fo totally, buried in Darkness and Oblivion!

We grant, that the Lord's Supper was then given to In fants; but were Apostolical Tradition and the Primitive Practice of the univerfal Church, alledg'd in its behalf? If not, it comes not up to the Case of Infant Baptism; but was a pure Mistake, grounded on a Text of Scripture that was not rightly understood. And what if our Church has, in less Time than half a Century, chang'd the Manner of Baptizing? Neither we nor our Advertaries are ignorant of it. We admitted of the Change as a Thing indifferent ; we deny it not, nor do we appeal to former Times, challenging the present Practice to have been the constant and univerfalUsage; neither are we the whole Church of Christ. Also what new things crept into the Church in those Centuries, and afterwards, in the miferable Reign of Ignorance and Barbarism, when the superstitious Seeds of Popery were fown in God's Field, may be eafily enough accounted for, without giving up the brightest Ages of the Church to an unaccountable Dulness and Stupidity.

Should Antipadobaptists, to justify their Cause, impadently publish it to the World, that no Infants were ever baptiz'd before the Reformation, there are a hundred thousand could quickly contradict and disprove them. Or should we Padobaptists, for the like End, shamelessly declare in Print, that Baptism was universally administred by Affusion of Water, and not by Immersion, 'till within these last Two hundred Years, there are thousands of Baptists would speedily refute and silence us, whatever others might do. We have now therefore some Knowledge and Understanding on all sides; only the Age of St. Jerom, St. Austin, and the blind Pelagians, was wrapp'd up in a Cimmerian Darkness, that could not see one or two Centuries behind! Had they been all Abderitans, that's worse than Alricans, they

could not well be more fenfelefs.

It is hard to speak out the necessary Result of this; That St. Austin shamefully ly'd; the Pelagians egregiously play'd the Fools, and betray'd their own Cause; and the whole Christian World were then extremely sottish. And 'till these Rubs be clearly remov'd, I must demur to our Adversaries Account of Infant Baptism, and firmly adhere to its Primitive and Universal Antiquity, as sounded upon Apostolical Practice and Authority.

"Much Use is made of the Fathers administring the Eucharist unto Infants. For, if in that they err'd and mistook the Scripture, they might likewise err about Infant

" Bap-

" Baptism. So their Authority is clean gone, and we must " nor build on the Testimony of such weak and fallible Men. "But how does it follow, that those who err in one Thing, must err in all Things; and shall merit no Credit, where they appear to be right, because they are failible? If these be necessary Consequences, then Mr. Gale has vented nothing but Errors throughout his Reflections, and has utterly lost his Credit. For, as sure I am, as there is a Sun in the Firmament, he is not right in all Particulars. If these Gentlemen would argue like found Logicians on this Article. they would not go about to prove, that the Fathers might err, which we deny not; but that they have actually err'd in the Case of Padobaptism, which is the Point in Question, and only to the Purpose. Whereas the Method they now take, is perfectly idle and inconclusive. The Fathers, fay they, were fallible Men, who not only might err, but, in fome Things, have actually err'd: Therefore, they might err in other Things, and, confequently, deserve no Credit. This does our Adversaries poor Service, while we deny, that in the present Case they have err'd, nor could well do it, when all Circumstances are considered. For the Dispute is now, not about Right, but Matter of Fact, that was of public Practice and Concernment; whereof the Church could not then be univerfally ignorant. All that this Attempt tends unto, both in the Medium and Conclufion, is only to destroy common Faith, by blasting the Reputation of Mankind.

FIN IS

ERRATA.

Predace, p. 7. l. ult. the Quatation is from Mr. Gale's Lett. 2. p. 85; p. 26. l. 32. I read and. p. 31. l. 16. r. the leaft. p. 38. l. 21. r. 27. p. 43. l. 11. for Thing, r. Hinge. p. 57. l. 29 r. incomplete. p. 64 l. 29. r. P. Fagius. p. 86. l. 17. r. mif understood. p. 91. l. 7. r. Proselyting. p. 97. l. 15. r. J. vamoth. p. 115. l. 10. r. Births. p. 116. l. 18. for th. y, r. all Persons p. 119. l. 14. after Baptisin, put a Full Stop. p. 121. l. 17. r. in our. p. 129. l. 33. r. Impudence. p. 132. l. 4. r. to them. p. 136. d. 2. r. I take. 155. l. 6. after any, put a Full Stop. p. 157. l. 28. r. Was Mr. Gale. p. 158. l. 17. r. from Abra. p. 159. l. 14. r. visibly. p. 162. l. 24. r. positive Ordinances. p. 163. l. 26. r Word. p. 174. l. 8 dele and Numb. ix. 17, &c. p. 182. l. 4. r. those. thid l. 26. read washing of Water. Ibid. l. 31. r. tight. p. 195. l. 13. r. the Commissions. p. 204. l. 14. r. the Baptism. p. 206. l. 23. r. not so.











